

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF FACTS,—
IS THERE, OR IS THERE NOT, A GOD?

WHAT OF A LIFE BEYOND?

Compiled and Edited
by
J. B. Murray

SOWERS PRINTING COMPANY
PRINTERS,
LEBANON, PA.

DEDICATION

*To 'The Man in the Street', and to any
Who think they lack time or ability
To solve for themselves
The Important Questions of Life.*

CONTENTS

'THE MAN IN THE STREET', WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS IN LIGHT OF FACTS,—

	PAGE
I. IS THERE, OR IS THERE NOT, A GOD?	5
II. WHAT OF A LIFE BEYOND?	55
III. WHY ARE SIN AND SUFFERING PERMITTED IN THE WORLD?	77
IV. REGARDING 'THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE' . .	89
V. WHAT IN THAT LIFE BEYOND?—HEAVEN ITSELF?	107
VI. HAS MATTER ALWAYS EXISTED?	125
VII. DOES THE BIBLE, IN ITS ESSENTIAL MESSAGE, PROVE ITSELF?	135
<hr/>	
LETTER FROM A LAYMAN TO 'THE MAN IN THE STREET'	144
VIII. WHAT OF HOPE FOR WRECKED LIVES?	155
IX. BELIEF AND TESTIMONY OF ONE	173
APPENDIX	189

I

IN LIGHT OF

FACTS

IS THERE, OR IS THERE NOT, A GOD?

IS NOT one of the most important questions to be settled in life, whether the universe and world we live in are ruled by God or are run by chance?

For on how that question is settled, does not the whole aspect of life,—our whole outlook upon it and one's whole course in it,—*turn*?

I

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF FACTS,—
IS THERE, OR IS THERE NOT, A GOD?

Obviously, either there is a God,—or there is no God.

By a God is meant a Supreme Being of infinite intelligence and power, who created and rules the universe;—in short, a Ruler of the universe.

THE FACTS BEFORE US

The universe is an existing fact. It is here. The sun, the earth, the moon, the planets, the stars, the earth’s component rocks, its products and its inhabitants are all here. They are all existing facts, which arouse thought and invite explanation.

Moreover, the universe is running. The earth and all the planets are revolving around the sun. The moon is revolving around the earth. Those revolutions are also existing facts.

THOSE FACTS CONSIDERED

If there is no God, and never has been, to create the universe, to arrange its various parts in order as we see them, and to set them to running;—it is evident that there has been no one in the universe to do any of those things for the universe;—is it not? And, since the universe is arranged in order, and is running (as we can see for ourselves), and hence those things have been done,—it is obvious that *the universe itself* must, in that case, of necessity, have done those things for itself;—must it not? For who else was there in the universe of matter to do those things for the universe of matter?

And the universe itself must, likewise of necessity, be running itself today;—must it not? For who else would there be to run it?

CREATION

To create, in its primary sense, does not mean to make something out of something else,—as a star out of already existing stardust, or a house out of brick,—as a man makes a thing out of existing materials; but means to bring something into being out of nothing.

Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Unabridged (Edition of 1928) thus defines,

“Create, 1. To cause to be or to come into existence, especially as distinguished from, or in opposition to, evolution or the modifying of anything already existent.”

Obviously, nothing cannot create something.

And for a universe to create itself,—that is, for a universe of nothing to create a universe of something,—is, of course, inconceivable, unbelievable, unthinkable;—is it not? Who could believe that? Reason revolts at the thought.

GEOMETRICAL PROOF

Geometry is an exact science. In it, nothing less than exact mathematical proof is accepted. In its propositions, each step is demonstrated with rigorous logic that admits no loophole of escape from the final conclusion arrived at.

One method of proof not infrequently used in geometry is called "*reductio ad absurdum*";—whereby any supposition or hypothesis contrary to, or inconsistent with a given proposition, is shown to be absurd, false or impossible; and hence the unavoidable conclusion is reached that *the given* proposition must, *of necessity*, be true. (x) (Illustration, Davies' Legendre,—Van Amringe's Edition, Book 1, Prop. XII, and others.)

It is submitted that applying this method of proof to the consideration of the alternatives that, either there is a God,—or there is no God;—whereby it appears, if there is no God, and never has been, that

(x) See Note A, Geometrical Proof by "*Reductio ad Absurdum*", Appendix, p 191.

there would be involved the necessity of a universe of nothing creating a universe of something;—not to say of wonders, not all as yet by any means fathomed by man;—and involving also the necessity of that universe arranging its various parts in order, and starting them to orderly running, as we see them running today;—any one of which suppositions is absurd or impossible;—falls under that method of geometrical proof, that is, a demonstration of the absurdity, falsity or impossibility of one of those two alternatives, and hence of the unavoidable conclusion that the other alternative (i. e. that there is a God) is—and needs must be—true.

Perhaps some one may claim that matter has always existed. That, however, would not solve the problem. For if matter had always existed, and had it therefore needed no God to create it,—and had there *never* been a God;—then, in that case, this universe of existing matter must still, of necessity, have arranged its various parts in order and have set them to orderly running, as we see them running today,—all of itself,—must it not? For who else would there have been in the universe of matter to do those things for it?

And that universe of matter must also, of necessity, be likewise running itself today;—must it not?

WHO,—OR WHAT,—ARRANGED THE UNIVERSE
IN ORDER?

When we leave things (matter) to arrange themselves (to arrange itself),—to do things for themselves (to do things for itself), and to set themselves in motion (to set itself in motion);—in other words, when we let chance arrange, set things in order, and set them to running, what do we find? Order or confusion?

Is not to ask the question, to answer it?

And which do we find reigning in the universe today;—Order or confusion?

Does not the order everywhere apparent,—no trees with roots in the air; each tree and shrub bearing leaves and seed after its own kind;—the oak, oak leaves and acorns; the maple, maple leaves; the pine tree, pine needles; and all of them doing this *regularly*; the Earth and the planets revolving in regular, orderly revolutions around the sun; the seasons succeeding each other with regularity, year in and year out; day regularly following night, etc., etc.,—seem to indicate with sufficient clearness that order and not confusion is reigning in the universe?

Does not that order, so pronounced throughout the universe and so generally recognized as to have become an accepted fact, crystallized by Pope into his immortal line, “Order is heaven’s first law”, seem sufficiently to answer the question, whether order or confusion is reigning in the universe?

And does not that order, everywhere prevailing, in turn seem equally to answer the question, whether chance is running this universe or not?

In face of the order we here find dominant, could we reasonably conclude that *that* order had all been brought about *by chance*?

But again, does chance *put* things in order?

We know that chance does not *put* things in order;—do we not?

Yet here we find substantially all things *put in order*;—do we not?

Hence, is it not obvious that chance never could have put all those things in the universe in their present consummate order?

And therefore, is it not consequently obvious that chance *did not* arrange those things all thus,—in their existing order?

How does matter arrange itself?

Take any fragments of matter (any things),—if left to themselves to arrange themselves, how do we find it is done? Is it not, as a rule, done haphazard,—just by chance? And as we have seen that chance could not and did not arrange all the ordered things in the universe; if matter, when left to itself, ordinarily arranges itself just by chance,—as we find it does,—does it not follow that matter itself,—the universe of matter,—could not have arranged all

those things,—all its various parts,—in order, either;—and therefore that matter did not, alone and unaided, arrange all its various parts in their existing consummate order?

And if this universe of matter did not thus arrange its various parts in order;—if matter did not do all this for itself, as we perceive it could not;—yet, since the universe is indeed arranged in order; in a word, since this has all been done; if the universe of matter could not, and did not do it for itself, —as we have seen it could not;—then is it not obvious that this orderly arrangement of its parts must,—of necessity,—have been done *for* it?

And if done for it,—for matter, for this universe of matter,—since neither matter itself, nor any part of matter, did all this, the question naturally arises, —*By whom was it done?*

By whom else could all this have been done *for* matter, than by some one *other than* matter? And by some one also *more potent than* matter;—else how could that some one have done for matter that which matter could not do?—in short, by a *Ruler* of matter,—a Ruler of the universe?

Does not the orderly arrangement of matter throughout the universe disclose a Ruler of matter, and His handiwork?

Who else could have done it?

WHO,—OR WHAT,—WAS IT THAT IMPARTED REGULAR
ORDERLY MOTION TO MATTER?

WHO,—OR WHAT,—WAS IT THAT IMPARTED
Different REGULAR ORDERLY MOTIONS TO
DIFFERENT PARTS OF MATTER?

WHO,—OR WHAT,—WAS IT THAT BALANCED THOSE
DIFFERENT REGULAR ORDERLY MOTIONS OF
DIFFERENT PARTS OF MATTER AGAINST
THE SUN'S DIFFERENT ATTRACTION
OF EACH PART?

But arranging matter in order is not all. Who,—or what,—was it that imparted regular orderly motion to matter, as we see through the telescope, has been done in the universe about us?

But imparting regular orderly motion to matter is not all. Who,—or what,—was it that imparted *different* regular orderly motions to *different parts* of matter, as by the telescope we see has been done to the various planets?

But imparting *different* regular orderly motions to different parts of matter is not all. Who,—or what,—was it that *balanced* those *different* regular orderly motions of different parts of matter against the sun's *different attraction* of each of those parts;

—as by the regular orderly revolutions of the Earth and other planets around the sun, we see has been done?

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The Earth moves round the sun. So do the other planets. But each planet moves *at a different speed*. Thus the Earth moves in its orbit (its regular pathway) around the sun with a speed of about 18 miles a second; Venus, next nearer to the sun, at about 22 miles a second; Mercury, nearest to the sun, at about 29; Mars, next further out beyond the Earth, at about 16 miles; Jupiter, next beyond, at about 8; Saturn, beyond Jupiter, at about 6; Uranus, the next, at about $4\frac{1}{2}$; and Neptune, the furthest out (save the recently discovered planet, Pluto), at only about 3 miles a second. (Compton's Encyclopedia, p. 2816, Planets.) (x)

Who,—or what,—was it that set each of those huge masses of matter to moving in just the right direction; and gave to each a different, but regular velocity?

Who,—or what,—was it that gave to each of those planets a velocity just sufficient *to balance* the sun's different attraction of each?

Did matter impart to different parts of itself regular orderly motion? Did matter start each of those parts off in a different (but right) direction?—and

(x) All references herein to, or extracts from, Compton's Encyclopedia are by permission of Messrs. F. E. Compton and Co. of Chicago, Illinois.

give to each part a different velocity? Did matter, moreover, balance that different velocity of each part against the sun's different attraction of that particular part?

Or did chance, perchance, do all those wonderful things?

Is either supposition conceivable?

Who can believe it?

Is not either supposition absurd on its face?

And if matter or chance did not do those things,—as we see they could not,—then who was it that did those things for matter,—to matter?

WHAT KEEPS THE EARTH REVOLVING AROUND THE SUN?

A stone left unsupported, is drawn by the earth's attraction (the earth's gravity), and 'falls' to the earth.

The earth is similarly attracted by the sun (the sun's gravitation). The earth is unsupported in space. What prevents the earth,—drawn by the sun's mighty attraction,—from falling into the sun?

On the other hand, what prevents the earth, flying, as it is, in its orbit at about 66,000 miles an hour,—that is, over five hundred times as fast as the fastest express train (Compton's Encyclopedia, p. 1063, Earth),—from dashing off its orbit out into space,—and there perhaps smashing into some other planet or star?

Did you ever tie a string to a stone and whirl it round your head?

What keeps the stone from flying off? The string.

What keeps the stone in its circle? The string.

If the string is too weak, or if you whirl the stone too fast;—what happens? Yes, the string breaks; the stone flies off, and perhaps hits somebody.

The rapidity of the whirl, therefore, has to be adjusted to the strength of the string. The faster you whirl the stone around, the greater the strain upon the string; and the stronger the string has to be.

The attraction of the planets by the sun (called the attraction of gravitation) is the string, which keeps them from flying off into space.

“Gravitation, 1. The force with which all bodies attract each other”. (Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Unabridged, Edition of 1928.)

“Sir Isaac Newton first proved that every planet is acted on by a force emanating from the sun, and he also proved that this force had a measurable relation to the distance of each planet from the sun.” (Compton’s Encyclopedia, p. 2816.)

This pull of the sun’s attraction diminishes as the planets are further off, very rapidly, that is, “inversely as *the square* of the distances between them.” (Compton’s Encyclopedia, p. 1058, Gravitation.)

As the strength of the sun’s string on the planets,—its attraction of them,—grows weaker with the greater distances they are off; the whirl of the stone,

—the speed of the planets,—must correspondingly diminish with distance, else they would break the weakening string (the sun's diminishing attraction) and fly off into space.

To prevent this,—the planet's breaking the string and flying off into space,—*the velocity* of each planet has therefore had to be adjusted to the strength of the string;—that is, *adjusted to the sun's attraction* of that particular planet;—which differs with each planet's distance from the sun.

The sun's attraction (gravitation), tending to draw the earth to the sun, is called the centripetal (center-seeking) force. The earth's speed in its orbit, which tends to break the string and cause the earth to fly off, like a stone from a sling, out into space, is called the centrifugal (center-fleeing) force. As is evident, the direction of the centrifugal force, tending to fly off, is not directly opposed in direction to the centripetal force, but is *at right angles to it*. That is to say, the direction of the sun's attraction of the earth is a straight line drawn from the earth to the sun. But the direction of the earth's tendency to fly off into space (like a stone from a sling) is a straight line drawn *at right angles* to the sun's attraction (that is, at right angles to the beginning of that line drawn from the earth to the sun).

These two forces, it will therefore be seen, are not pulling in precisely opposite directions,—but each

is pulling *at right angles* to the other; and yet those two forces, pulling at right angles to each other, have to be, and are, *balanced against each other!!*

To compute, and to adjust those opposing forces, as we perceive they are adjusted, involve calculations which it would tax our ablest mathematicians to make. And when made, then to start those huge masses of matter to moving sidewise, each *in just the right direction*, and each with just the right (and *a different*) speed, involved an intelligence, a knowledge, a skill and especially *a power*, possessed by Omnipotence alone.

WHAT DO ASTRONOMERS FIND?

As a matter of fact, what do astronomers find?

They find, in point of fact, that against the mighty pull of the sun,—diminishing so fast as distance increases,—the velocity of each of the planets,—each so differently distanced,—has been as differently,—*balanced!!*

Marvelous! Is it not? Especially with such immense masses of matter,—some of them over 700 times the size of this earth!! (Compton's Encl. p. 2817.)

Could chance have done all that?

Who could believe it?

Is it not incredible?

Is it not impossible for chance to have done all that? Or for matter?

And if chance or matter did not do all that,—as we see they could not,—who then did it?

THE FACTS

Planets' Distances and Speeds Compared

Astronomers find that Mercury, at a mean distance from the sun of about 36 million miles, has, as noted above, a velocity of about 29 miles a second; Venus, about 67 million miles away, has a speed of about 22 miles a second; the Earth, at about 93 millions, about 18 miles; Mars, at about 141 millions, about 16 miles; Jupiter, at about 483 million miles, about 8 miles; Saturn, at about 886 millions, about 6 miles; Uranus, at about 1782 million miles, about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles; and Neptune, about 2792 million miles distant, a velocity of but about 3 miles a second. (Compton's Encl. p. 2816) (Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th Edition, Volume 17, p. 998a:—for distances only, the velocities are not given.)

It is this balancing of the whirl of each planet,—that is, of the velocity of each planet,—against the sun's mighty pull on that planet, which, like the balancing of the whirl of the stone against the strength of the string, keeps the earth and each of the other planets in its orbit and prevents its flying off into space. And it is that balancing of those two forces against each other which has thus kept the earth in its orbit for myriads of years,—during the millions of years that scientists tell us (by going back to the

earth's formation, or to when it was a molten ball of fire, that is, ages before the rocks had formed upon it, even before the igneous or fire rocks, the primeval granite and gneiss, first of all and underlying all other rocks, had formed as a scum upon that molten mass, and, as the outside cooled down, had hardened into a hot crust;—that is, ages before the first germs of life, animal or vegetable, could possibly have existed upon the earth)—during which scientists tell us this earth has existed and been swinging round the sun. (The “Earth must at one time have been a mass of molten rock.” . . . “We may say, therefore, that the Earth cannot be less than 100,000,000 years old.”—Compton's Encl., p. 1060, Earth.)

HOW IS THE BALANCING PROVEN?

That fact, by the way,—the planets' continuing to swing round in their orbits,—incidentally demonstrates the balancing of those two forces,—the sun's attraction by the planet's velocity. For had those forces not been balanced,—had either of them been but a little stronger,—the planet would, on its first revolution around the sun, have deviated from its true orbit by a little; and then,—by reason of the thereby consequently increased (or diminished) attraction of the sun (as the planet was nearer to the sun or further from it),—would, with each succeeding revolution, have deviated increasingly; thereby

developing (unless readjusted by counterbalancing causes) from an inappreciable deviation into a substantial one; and then, in those myriads of years, into an ever-increasing spiral, leading toward the sun, or out into space. (x) But, as a matter of fact, astronomers find the planets (barring some slight fluctuations, aberrations, or perturbations, caused by other planets, the moon, etc., which usually, if not always, are corrected or readjusted by counterbalancing causes) are traveling in substantially their true orbits around the sun, and not in spirals either toward or away from it. This is shown, in the case of the Earth, by the fact that astronomers' calculations of *eclipses, made years and years in advance* of their occurrence (based upon the Earth being in its true orbit), *come out right*. That is to say, the eclipses arrive substantially on time; and thereby demonstrate that the Earth is traveling substantially in its true orbit and is not out on a spiral;—for had the Earth been traveling out on a spiral, it would not have arrived at the calculated position in its orbit necessary to produce the eclipse; but would have been out on a spiral; and hence, not being at the calculated position in its orbit, the eclipse would not have arrived as calculated, and perhaps not at all. (xx) But as the calculated eclipses do arrive

(x) See Note B, The Sun's Attraction Balanced by Planet's Velocity. Appendix, p. 191.

(xx) See Note C, Eclipses. Appendix, p. 197.

on time, that shows that the Earth is moving substantially in its true orbit, and is not out on a spiral. And the Earth's being substantially in its true orbit today, shows that it has been traveling in substantially its true orbit *throughout all the ages of the past*;—for had it *once gotten substantially off its orbit*, out onto a spiral, that spiral would (for reasons above) have gone on increasing, and the Earth would be *increasingly off its orbit today*. The fact then, that the Earth is in its true orbit today, shows that the Earth must, for above reasons, have been substantially in its true orbit during all those past ages;—that is to say, from the very beginning; that is, *from, and at, the time of the Earth's first revolution around the sun*.

And the fact that the Earth is in its true orbit today also shows that those two forces, the sun's attraction (the centripetal) and the Earth's velocity (the centrifugal),—the balancing of which forces keep the Earth in its orbit,—*are balanced today*. And the fact that those two forces are balanced today shows that they must have been balanced during all those ages of the past (else the Earth would have gotten off its orbit and be out on a spiral today). And having been balanced throughout all the ages of the past, shows that those two forces must have been balanced from the very beginning;—that is, *from, and at, the time of the Earth's first revolution around the sun*.

And what is true of the Earth is equally true of each of the other planets.

Indeed, so exactly are those two forces balanced in the case of each planet; and so exactly are the movements of each planet calculated, kept track of, and known; that it was by reason of Uranus (then the most distant planet known) being about two minutes late in its orbit, that another planet,—Neptune,—was suspected; and, by mathematical calculations, its direction was located (by two astronomers separately) and upon the telescope's being turned that way, was discovered! (Compton's Encl. p. 244, Astronomy.)

So much for the accuracy of the movements of the planets, involving and proving the accuracy of their revolutions in their orbits and the balancing of their centrifugal against the centripetal forces, from and at their *first* revolution around the sun.

Who,—or what,—was it that did all this mighty and exact balancing of speed against pull; that started each of those huge masses of matter in just the right directions around the sun, and each with a velocity just necessary to counterbalance the sun's different attraction of each?

Was it matter that did those mighty and wondrous things to itself;—and all of itself alone?

Or did chance, by any possibility, do them all?

Is it believable? Is it conceivable?

Who can believe it?

What says reason?

What says common sense?

What says science?

Where do we ever find chance working in such wondrous ways as those?

WHO THEN,—OR WHAT,—ADJUSTED THIS
VAST MACHINERY OF HEAVEN?

As we have seen that matter could not even arrange its various parts in their present consummate order, how much less could it impart to various parts of itself such orderly, such diverse, such complicated, and such nicely calculated motions, as we find these various parts possess; and then balance each of their various velocities so exactly against the different pulls of the sun? And as we see that matter could not do these things for itself, yet, as we also see that all those things exist, that is, have been done, is not the conclusion forced upon us that those things,—in short that this marvelous adjustment of the vast machinery of heaven,—must, from the nature of the case, have had to be done *for* matter?

What other conclusion is there?

And in answer to the constantly recurring question,—by whom have all those mighty deeds been wrought for matter?—is it not manifest that they must have been wrought *for* matter by some one *other than* matter; and necessarily by some one

more potent than matter (to do what matter could not) ; and by some one possessed of intelligence,—of infinite intelligence,—as well as of infinite power? For had that one not possessed infinite intelligence, how could that one ever have accurately measured or calculated those mighty opposing forces, the sun's attraction of gravitation upon each planet, and the velocity needed by that planet, pulling at right angles to the sun's attraction, in order to balance that attraction?—and attracting each planet differently?

And had that some one not possessed infinite power, how could that one ever have put his calculations into practical operation? How could that some one ever have imparted to each of those huge masses of matter, the planets, the proper speed to just counterbalance that mighty pull of the sun, which (by whatever name called,—x) is calculated to exert upon Neptune *alone*, the most distant of all the planets (save Pluto),—

(Further Existing Fact to be Considered)

a pull “equal to . . a column of steel 500 miles thick and 2791 million miles long”? (Compton's Encl. p. 3394, Sun.)

Who could that some one be,—other than matter,—more potent than matter,—more intelligent than matter,—controlling matter?

(x) See Note D, Gravitation and Einstein. Appendix, p 199.

Who could it be,—endowed with infinite intelligence and infinite power,—other than a Ruler of matter,—a Ruler of the universe?

FURTHER FACTS

Twenty-six Moons

But that is not all. The Earth has a moon revolving around it, held in place by a similar invisible cord,—the Earth's attraction of it.

Mars has two such moons,—of which one (Phobos) revolves three times around Mars, while Mars is turning on its axis but once (Compton's Encl. p. 2819). Jupiter has nine,—of which two, curiously enough, revolve in a direction *directly opposite* to that of the other seven (p. 2819); Saturn has at least nine; Uranus four and Neptune one,—in all, at least twenty-six. (Compton's Encl. p. 2818.)

All these twenty-six moons are revolving in their orbits around their respective planets, *each held in its orbit by its own invisible cord*,—the attraction of its own particular planet upon it.

And these planets all, with their revolving moons, are themselves revolving around the sun, whose attraction prevents them all from flying off into space.

“No machine that man has made moves so perfectly, so silently, as this company of worlds.” (Compton's Encl. p. 247.)—

Did matter do all this for itself?

Or did chance?

Who can think it? Who can believe it? Is it not absurd to suppose it?

Who,—or what,—was it that provided each of the planets, save Mercury and Venus (both so near the sun they needed none), with a moon or moons to give added light and heat?

Who,—or what,—was it that started all those moons to moving in their various orbits?—each in *just the right direction*, and each with *just the right velocity* to counterbalance the *different* attraction of its own particular planet;—which depended not alone upon that moon's *distance* from its planet; but also upon that planet's size or *mass*;—and hence involved six different computations of gravitational attraction (instead of but one as in the case of the sun and planets), and the calculations of twenty-six different moon speeds, instead of but eight (as in the case of the planets and sun);—and thereby involved more calculations (and ones more complex) than those of the sun and planets;—and yet all necessarily just as accurate,—else moons off their orbits would be flying about in spirals,—which is not perceived to be the case?

Who made all those different intricate calculations that were needed before those many moons could be set to moving, each in just the right direction in its

own orbit, and each with *just the right velocity*;—all of which, by the telescope, astronomers perceive has been done?

Could matter do all those various things of itself?—to itself?

Or did chance do them all,—perchance?

Is not such a thought an absurdity?

Is not to ask those questions, to answer them?

Where do we ever find things, left to themselves, doing such orderly, such difficult, such nicely calculated, such complex things for themselves,—and all so accurately?

Yet all those things have indeed been done, as we may readily see through the telescope.

And if done,—if now existing,—(as we can readily assure ourselves they are); and not done *by* matter (as they manifestly could not have been); then it follows, of necessity,—does it not?—that those things must, indeed, have been done *for* matter,—must they not?

What other conclusion is there? Is there any other alternative?

And if done for matter, then necessarily done by some one else *other* than matter. Is not that so?

And necessarily done by some one more intelligent and more potent than matter,—to do what matter could not do. Is not that so?

And hence that those things were done by some one superior to matter. Is not that so?

Who could that some one be,—other than matter, more intelligent and more potent than matter, and superior to matter,—save a Ruler of matter?

What other alternative is there?

And if a Ruler of matter, then a Ruler of the material universe. Is not that so?

Then that some one, other than matter, more intelligent and more potent than matter, superior to matter, who did those things *for* matter, could have been none other than a Ruler of matter, Ruler and God of the universe. Is not that so?

Are we not then but again driven back to the same conclusion arrived at before, that there is, and needs must be, a Ruler, God of the universe?

What other conclusion is there?

WHO OR WHAT IMPARTED TO THE EARTH ITS LATERAL MOTION?

We have seen that matter, while attracting other outside matter towards itself, is unable to impart to itself motion of any kind. Its inertia prevents its doing so. ("Inertia, 2. *Physics*. That property of matter by virtue of which it persists in its state of rest" Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Unabridged, Edition of 1928). This one can readily test, if desired, by putting a few stones by themselves, and seeing if they will start to moving. Their inertia prevents their doing so.

The sun's attraction (gravitation) draws, as we have seen, the Earth (outside matter) toward itself. But the Earth has a lateral or sidewise motion, approximately at right angles to the line of the sun's attraction, which sends the Earth forward in its pathway around the sun and prevents the Earth from being drawn into the sun. The question is, who or what gave to the Earth that sidewise motion?

Obviously, the Earth (matter) could not have imparted to itself that motion;—or, indeed, any other. Its inertia prevents.

Could the sun's attraction have imparted to the Earth that lateral motion? You say, Impossible!—and you are right. The sun's attraction, drawing the Earth directly, in a straight line, towards the sun, could not have imparted to the Earth a sidewise motion at variance with the line of that attraction by the sun. Still less could it have caused the Earth to move at right angles to the line of that attraction.

With the sun and Earth powerless to do so, is there *any physical force in the universe* that could have imparted to the Earth that lateral motion?

Apart from a few physical forces which act by repulsion (such as like poles of electricity, the expansion of gases, etc.) the chief physical forces which generate motion in matter are forces that attract

matter;—such as the attraction of gravitation, of electricity, etc. Those forces, like the sun's attraction, impart motion to matter outside the attracting bodies, by drawing that matter directly toward themselves. But neither the sun, the Earth, nor any other attracting body imparts to the object attracted, a motion at variance with, or at right angles to, the line of its own attraction of that object.

Hence, for any physical force to impart to the Earth a lateral motion at right angles to the line of the sun's attraction of the Earth, would require that that attracting physical force or body be located in front of the Earth; at some distance from it; and approximately at right angles to the line of the sun's attraction of the Earth.

Obviously, if that laterally attracting force or body continued to attract the Earth *too long*, the Earth would thereby acquire too great a lateral velocity,—which, thereby overcoming the sun's attraction, would send the Earth flying out into space, like a stone shot from a sling.

Hence it is evident that any such outside attracting physical force would need to be shut off or neutralized at just the right instant of time;—that is, when the Earth had acquired just the right velocity. To thus neutralize or shut off that attracting force would require the intervention of some other force or power; and also that that intervention should be applied at just the right instant. For that interven-

ing force to be applied at just the right instant would require, first, an intelligent calculation *in advance*, or just *when* the attracting physical force would have imparted to the Earth the needed velocity; and, second, would require further intelligence *to apply* that intervening force at just *that* right instant.

Therefore, any attracting physical force imparting that lateral motion to the Earth would require the assistance of an outside *intelligently directed* force, or of an outside *intelligent Power*, to intervene and shut off or neutralize the physically attracting force at just the right instant. In either case, that attracting physical force would therefore require, in order to impart to the Earth that lateral motion, the assistance of *an outside intelligence* or *Power*.

The Earth, as we have seen, has a lateral velocity in its orbit round the sun of about 66,000 miles an hour. Hence to impart that velocity to the Earth, any laterally attracting force or body would need to possess an equal or greater force; and the intervening force or Power would necessarily need also to be at least as great.

It is of course obvious, that if the intervening Power should, *instead of intervening*, apply its force *direct* to the Earth, it could thereby impart to the Earth that lateral velocity, *direct*. If thus applied

direct, the force of that Power could then be gauged in advance, to impart to the Earth just the necessary velocity and no more;—thereby avoiding the risk and fatal consequences of imparting to the Earth an excess of lateral speed. Moreover, if thus applied direct, manifestly, the physically attracting force or body could be *dispensed with* entirely.

Altogether, why would not the application of the force of that intervening Power to the Earth *direct*,—to impart to the Earth the lateral motion needed,—be simpler and safer, besides dispensing with any physically attracting force or body altogether?—And, to keep that attracting force or body steadily located at approximately *right angles* to the line of the sun's attraction of the Earth might,—*after the Earth began revolving* around the sun,—be attended with certain difficulties. And to that intervening Power, would not the application of its force *direct* to the Earth, be just as easy as to intervene?—not to say easier?

Whichever method were adopted, is it not obvious that for any physically attracting force to impart to the Earth the lateral motion which the Earth possesses, *the assistance* of an outside, intelligent, controlling Power was indispensably needed? Is not that so?

Consequently, is it not manifest that for any physical force to impart to the Earth that lateral motion, the assistance of an outside intelligence Power was *indispensable*?

Electricity, like gravitation, is an attracting force which draws other matter attracted directly toward itself. It therefore, like gravitation, is powerless to impart to matter attracted by it, a lateral motion at right angles to the line of its own attraction of that matter. Hence all conclusions reached in regard to gravitation apply with equal force to electricity;—as well as to every other physical force which acts by attraction.

Manifestly, then, no physical attracting force in the universe, acting by itself alone, is able to impart to a body it attracts, a lateral motion at right angles to the line of its own attraction of that body. And consequently, is it not also manifest that there is, and was, no physically attracting force in the universe which, acting by itself alone, was able to impart to the Earth its lateral motion?

Forces which act by repulsion repel also in straight lines; and hence are equally powerless to impart to objects repelled by them any lateral motion at right angles to the line of their repulsion.

The truth of these conclusions is also demonstrated in mechanics by the parallelogram of forces. That parallelogram shows that no force acting in any given direction, contains within itself any factor whatever of a force acting at right angles to the line of the direction of that force.

From all of which is it not manifest that there is *no physical force* in the universe, which, acting by itself *alone*, could have imparted to the Earth that lateral motion?

No physical force is endowed with intelligence. No physical force acts with discrimination, or controls or limits its own action. They all act blindly, indiscriminately, continuously, and ruthlessly, regardless of consequences. Neither does any of them calculate in advance the effect of its action.

Manifestly, then, to impart to the Earth that lateral motion by means of any physical force in the universe, would require action on the part of an outside, intelligent, controlling Power.

Furthermore, is it not also manifest that any such intelligent Power could, instead of assisting, have imparted to the Earth that lateral motion *direct*? And hence that such intelligent, controlling Power may have done so?

We all know the Earth revolves around the sun. That we can tell by the changing seasons of the year.

The Earth, then, visibly possesses that lateral motion. Does it not?

Unable to impart that motion to itself, that lateral motion, therefore, from the necessities of the case, must have been imparted *to* the Earth. Must it not?

And the only question is, by what or by whom?

With all the physical forces in the universe alike powerless to impart that lateral motion to the Earth (unless assisted by an outside, intelligent, controlling Power) ; since the Earth visibly possesses that motion (which hence of necessity must have been imparted to it) ; is it not manifest that an outside Power, intelligent and controlling, has, necessarily, acted in the matter and has either assisted to impart, or else has imparted direct to the Earth, that lateral motion? Is not that so? Is there any other alternative?

What is such a Power, outside all the physical forces of the universe, intelligent and controlling matter, but a Ruler of matter, a Ruler of the universe?

Hence, then, is it not manifest that it was none other than a Ruler of matter, Ruler of the universe, who thus, either directly or indirectly, imparted to the Earth that lateral motion? Is not that so?

What other conclusion is there?

Is any other conclusion possible?

Is there any other alternative?

Do not the lateral motions possessed by the other eight planets, each of which involves the same problem, lead us to a like conclusion?

And the 26 moons,—each of which possesses a

similar lateral motion which involves the same problem,—do they not also each lead us to the same conclusion? It is submitted that they do.

But again, what was there to prevent that Ruler of the universe, instead of intervening, from adopting the simpler method of imparting that lateral motion to the Earth *direct*; and from thereby dispensing with all physical forces, as needless? That is to say, what was there to prevent the Ruler of the universe from starting the Earth, at its initial revolution around the sun, with just the lateral velocity needed? That, as we earlier saw, was an *indispensable prerequisite* to the Earth's continuing to remain revolving in its orbit;—as we find the Earth has been doing through the ages, and is still doing today (See ante, "How is the Balancing Proven?").

By this it is not meant to say that the Ruler of the universe necessarily did start the Earth in an instant, from a state of rest to a speed of about 66,000 miles an hour. The application of such a force would, of course, by reason of the heat thereby generated, have reduced the Earth to a molten mass (which the Earth, at one time, was,—Compton's Encl. p. 1060,—and would thus account for that condition, which otherwise it might be difficult to explain). It would also account for the molten lava still flowing intermittently from volcanoes all round

the Earth (of which Kilauea in the Hawaiian Islands, with its three-mile wide crater of liquid lava, at times overflowing, is an instance). (Compton's Encl. p. 1602, Hawaiian Islands.)

That He had power to do that thing is evidenced by other of His acts throughout the universe. Consider for a moment but a single star out of the 2,500 visible to the naked eye (or of the 25,000 visible through the telescope) that is that of Betelguese (in Orion), a star so huge that with its diameter of approximately 300,000,000 miles it would more than fill up the entire orbit of the Earth round the sun (having a diameter of less than 185,000,000 miles); and would more than fill up Mars' larger orbit (having a diameter of less than 290,000,000 miles); which star (Betelguese) is *molten* and *blazing* like our sun, as are also all the 25,000 other stars (Compton's Encl. p. 3342, Star); some of which are reported to be moving at speeds of 200 miles a second, —720,000 miles an hour,—ten times faster than our Earth; and all of which are *molten* and *blazing* like our sun. (Compton's Encl. p. 3342.)

It is possible He may have chosen to impart that lateral motion to the Earth gradually, by speeding it along some pathway in the heavens until it had acquired the desired velocity, and then to have guided it into its orbit. All that was for Him to choose and do. To the Omnipotent all those things are possible, and are but details.

But if He started that huge mass, Betelgueuse, to moving; and all the other 25,000 stars likewise to moving; *and with such velocities*; why, it is submitted, would He not be able to start our tiny Earth,—this little pinhead,—to moving also; and with its comparatively insignificant velocity?

However all that may be, the fact remains that the Earth possesses that lateral motion which it was powerless to impart to itself; and hence which was, necessarily, imparted to it.

All the physical forces in the universe (un-assisted) were, as we have seen, alike powerless to impart to the Earth that lateral motion; which, as we have also seen, could be imparted to it only by a Ruler of matter, a Ruler of the universe.

Since the Earth, as a matter of fact, possesses that lateral motion which only a Ruler of the universe could impart, is it not manifest that a Ruler of the universe must necessarily *have acted* in the matter to impart that motion to the Earth? For had He not acted, how could that motion ever have been imparted to the Earth?

Consequently, is it not manifest that a Ruler of the universe did act in the matter?

And if a Ruler of the universe acted in the matter, then, manifestly, a Ruler of the universe exists.

Are we not then but once again driven to the same, ever-recurring conclusion that there exists in the universe a Ruler, God over it?

SUMMARY

Briefly, then, what have we seen?

Either that there is a God;—or there is no God.

And if there is no God, no Ruler of the universe, and never has been; then, that nothing must have created something; that matter must have arranged the various parts of the universe in their consummate order; must have set a number of those parts to moving in different directions; must have imparted to each of those parts a different, orderly lateral motion; must have just balanced that lateral motion against the different attraction of an outside attracting body; which attraction matter must, in each case, have been necessarily *calculated* in advance, as well as also the lateral velocity needed by such part to counterbalance that attracting force.

For if there was no one in the universe to do those things for matter, manifestly matter must needs have done those things for itself.

In a word, that matter must have planned, calculated in advance and then accordingly have set in motion, all the vast machinery of heaven!

Those things, as we have seen, matter could not do.

And since matter could not, and hence did not do those things for itself; yet, as those things exist and hence necessarily have been done; we see, with

matter powerless to do them, that those things must, of necessity, have been done *for* matter.

And if done *for* matter, as we see they must have been, then that they must have been done for matter by some one *other than* matter; by some one more intelligent and more potent than matter (to do what matter could not); in a word, that they must have been done for matter by some one possessed of infinite intelligence and infinite power; in brief, by a controller of matter, a Ruler over matter and the universe.

Hence we find ourselves repeatedly driven to the same conclusion that there exists in the universe a Ruler of matter, God of the universe.

THE DOMINANT FACTOR IN THE UNIVERSE AN ESTABLISHED FACT

Viewed then from whatever standpoint we will;—whether from that of plain, ordinary common sense and the order reigning throughout the universe, not possibly arranged by matter or chance;—or from a survey of the heavens and its wondrously organized and moving machinery; or from the imparting of lateral motion to the Earth, to the planets, and to their many moons;—the conclusion arrived at is ever the same, that there exists in the universe a Power, other than matter, intelligent, and more potent than matter, controlling matter and superior to matter;—in short, a Ruler of matter;—Ruler and God of the universe.

All the fingers of proof point but the one way.

And a little further thought will readily develop many other like fingers.

This then, the greatest, the dominant, the controlling Fact and Factor in the universe, the existence of a Ruler over it, God of the universe, becomes an established fact. Does it not?

And His existence here becomes the most patent and most potent Fact in the universe.

COMMON SENSE

In the foregoing investigation regarding a Ruler of the universe, is it not worthy of note that common sense,—plain ordinary common sense, the sense with which the Almighty has endowed each one of human kind,—is, and ever has been, sufficient to enable any one of us to solve for ourselves this,—the first and most important of all the problems of life,—whether we are living in a universe governed by a God, or in a universe run by chance?

Since the Almighty has thus endowed each of us with an intelligence sufficient to solve for ourselves this first and greatest question of life, why should we not make use of our God-given powers and do a little thinking for ourselves, individually;—rather than leave such an all-important question for others to decide for us?

Indeed, is it not more satisfactory to the mind, as well as more convincing, for each one to realize for himself and herself the impossibility of nothing having created something; and the equal impossibility of matter or chance having arranged the various parts of the universe in order, as we see them about us;—the sun, the earth, the other planets and all their many moons in their consummate order; or of matter or chance having started them to moving in their different directions, each with its orderly and different velocity just balanced against the different attraction of an outside body; and thereby for each of us to realize and decide for himself, the impossibility of all those things having been done by matter or chance; and hence to reach the conclusion for himself or herself that, it being impossible for matter to have done those things for itself, they therefore must have been done *for* matter; and hence have been done by some one *other than* matter, *more potent* than matter, *superior* to matter, in short, by an intelligent, all-powerful Ruler of matter,—Ruler and God of the universe; than it is for us to rest our belief regarding those matters upon some one else's opinion or say-so?

Which is more convincing to the mind,—our own carefully thought-out conclusion,—or the opinion of somebody else? And if that some one else should, perchance, happen to change his opinion overnight, and we not be informed of it,—what then? Where then would we stand?

WHICH IS SAFER?

If perchance one had passed on to the Beyond, and later on, that some one else happened to change his opinion, thereby leaving the one in the Beyond resting on a false foundation;—where then would that one stand?

In every aspect of the case then, why is it not better and safer to think the matter through for oneself; decide it for oneself; and act accordingly?

If not, why not?

WHY NOT VENTURE TO THINK A LITTLE FOR
ONESELF?

Since each one of us must, ultimately, bear the consequences of our decisions and of our resulting acts here; why is it not better, as well as safer, for each of us to at least look matters squarely in the face; and, seeing for ourselves the impossibility of nothing creating something; or of chance or matter arranging and starting the various parts of the universe in their order and to running in their marvelously adjusted ways; to venture out upon, and trust a little to our own God-given common sense, just a little bit; and do a little thinking for ourselves on this, and on other kindred vital subjects?

BUT LITTLE TIME OR THOUGHT REQUIRED

But very little time and very little thought are required to satisfy oneself of the existence of a God.

Anyone is quite competent to do so; and,—if he or she will take a little time to consider it,—to think out for himself or herself, his or her own conclusion in this matter.

A COLLEGE OR HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION NOT NECESSARY

To solve this question, it is worthy of note that a college or even a high school education is not at all necessary.

A SHEPHERD BOY

A shepherd boy,—a musician, later a poet and afterwards a king,—over two thousand years ago, gazing upward at the moon and stars,—those wondrous proofs of power and wisdom,—with no college or even high school education to aid him,—solved this problem for himself and for millions of others all down the centuries of time.

“When”, said he, “I consider thy heavens,
the work of thy fingers,

“The moon and the stars, which
thou hast ordained;

“What is man, that thou art mindful of him?

“And the son of man, that thou
visitest him?

“For thou hast made him but little
lower than God,

"And crownest him with glory and honor.

"Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;

"Thou hast put all things under his feet:

"O Jehovah, our Lord,

"How excellent is thy name in all the earth!" (Psalms 8:3-9, R. V.) (x)

SPEECHLESS!

When we come finally to stand before the Eternal, and face the consequences of our acts,—resulting from our choices and decisions here,—and stand there,—alone,—before Him, what will it avail us to plead, "I believed and followed what others told me"?

To the reply, "You were endowed with a mind and reasoning powers sufficient to decide those questions for yourself aright. Why did you lean upon a broken reed, when you could thus have decided them by your own common sense; and thereby have saved yourself from the pitfalls and snares of life? Why did you wrap your powers in a napkin and leave them unused?"

What answer shall we be able to make?

How will it be possible for us to make any answer at all?

(x) "R V" stands for "American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible", called the "Revised Version", copyrighted in 1929 by the International Council of Religious Education. All quotations are by permission

Can we do otherwise than stand there,—speechless?

TO GUIDE OUR BARQUE

Is it not better, therefore, that each one of us make use of our own God-given powers to do a little thinking for ourself and thus, with God's help, guide our barque safely across the ocean of life?

HIS FEET ON ROCK

And if one does thus think matters through for himself, he is not then obliged to shift his belief with anyone else's changing opinion or say-so; meanwhile not knowing exactly what he really does, or does not, believe; nor why he believes it.

Having thought the matter through once for all; having tested its foundations; having decided for himself, and thereby put his feet upon solid rock; he is prepared to stand firm, regardless of the changing opinions of others.

HIS MIND AT REST

Then, after all, why is not the plain common sense consideration of the subject much the more satisfactory?

By it, while still being willing and prepared to weigh the opinions of others for whatever they may be worth; one is not, like a weather-vane, obliged

to shift his belief with every whiff of changing opinion or doctrine.

One knows what he believes, and why he believes it. His mind is at rest.

Why is not thinking the matter through and deciding the question for oneself, much the better way?

WHAT THE ALTERNATIVE?

Is not this the alternative we face?

Either there is a God,—or there is no God.

If there is no God, then, as we have seen, a universe of nothing must have created a universe of something; matter and chance must have arranged and set the various parts of this universe in order, and set them to orderly running in their various orbits, each with a different velocity, just balanced against the different attraction of an outside body. That is to say, chance or its equivalent must have made all those wonderful plans and nice adjustments; and must have carried them into operation.

That alternative,—chance or God,—is up to every man for his decision.

That alternative,—chance or God,—is up to you and is up to me for our decision.

Which of the two,—chance or God,—seems to be the more reasonable explanation of the wonders of the universe? Which of the two seems the more reasonable conclusion to reach?—and which the safer foundation upon which to build our life here and our future hereafter?

Which of the two in your opinion presents fewer difficulties?

When we note the wisdom,—the surpassing wisdom,—everywhere displayed,—far surpassing the wisdom of human kind,—is it reasonable to attribute such wisdom as that *to chance*?

ALMOST A WASTE OF TIME

Indeed, when we come to consider it, so strong are the proofs before us, and so obvious the conclusion, does it not seem almost like a waste to devote so much time to investigating the existence of a God, when His existence is so patent and proven before our eyes?

Only the all-controlling importance of the subject, present conditions, and testing the foundations upon which our whole life here and hereafter rests, justify us in so doing;—in order to satisfy ourselves beyond a peradventure, of the fact of His existence.

WHAT SAYS SCIENCE?

Sir Oliver Lodge, the distinguished and internationally known scientist, in an article entitled, "Matter, Ether and Energy", published in *The Scientific American* of August, 1925, wrote:

"Depend upon it, nothing is haphazard, things are not left to chance. . . . Everything points to a rational Plan. . . . Humanity has a potential

future beyond our wildest dreams!" (From Reprint in *Literary Digest* of August 29, 1925.)

Thomas A. Edison,—that wizard in practical science,—upon being asked by his friend, Harvey S. Firestone, what he thought was the controlling power of the universe, "expressed himself along the same lines as he had in previous discussions, especially on the camping trip we made after attending President Harding's funeral, when he said:

'I believe in the teachings of our Lord and Master. There is a great directing head of people and things—a Supreme Being who looks after the destinies of the world.' " (From "Firestone Tells of Edison Belief in Higher Power—Was Sure Universe Had Supreme Ruler."—*New York Herald-Tribune*, October 19, 1931, p. 11.)

One of the chief, if not the chief practical scientist of all time,—who harnessed electricity in so many ways to man's service,—is thus shown to be a firm believer in "a Supreme Being who looks after the destinies of the world."

What scientist is there of any time who would not feel honored to be found standing alongside of Edison?

UNAIDED EYES OF UNLEARNED MEN SUFFICIENT

Is it not especially worthy of note, that the proofs of God's existence, as seen by the unaided eyes of unlearned man, are, as we have seen, just as strong,

just as convincing, just as unanswerable, as any proofs adduced through science; and quite sufficient to satisfy one of the existence of a God?

Scientific facts (carefully to be distinguished from scientific theories, which necessarily often have to be changed to fit later discoveries, and therefore are necessarily liable to shift) do but add to, and clinch those proofs, which are visible to all;—that the universe is run and regulated by a Ruler, and not by chance.

IS THE MATCHLESS POEM TRUE?

Addison, the distinguished English poet, found in the heavens the same compelling proofs of the existence of the Almighty as had David over 2000 years before him, and expressed it in his matchless poem:

The spacious firmament on high,
With all the blue ethereal sky,
And spangled heavens, a shining frame,
Their great Original proclaim:
Th' unwearied sun from day to day,
Does his Creator's pow'r display,
And publishes to ev'ry land
The work of an almighty hand.

Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale,
And nightly to the list'ning earth,
Repeats the story of her birth;
Whilst all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn,
Confirm the tidings as they roll,
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

What tho' in solemn silence, all
Move round this dark terrestrial ball?
What tho' no real voice nor sound
Amidst their radiant orbs be found?
In reason's ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice,
Forever singing as they shine,
'The hand that made us is divine.'

Do they not thus bear witness?
And is not their witness true?

What say you?

What, then, if your verdict?

Is there?—or is there not?—a Ruler of the universe,—God?

*

*

*

II

IN LIGHT OF

FACTS

WHAT OF A LIFE BEYOND?

AFTER having settled that God rules the universe, is not the next pressing question in life whether, when life here is ended, we are to have another life in the Beyond? For if not, if death ends all and we are to die like beasts of the field, may not life's motto become, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die"?

Upon how that question of a future life is settled, does not therefore the whole aspect of life here,—our whole outlook upon it and one's whole course in it,—*turn*?

II

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,

WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS

IN LIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC AND OTHER FACTS,—

WHAT OF A LIFE BEYOND?

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

On the Earth and in the universe about us we see displayed on every hand evidences of the highest intelligence;—evidences of a wisdom far exceeding that of human kind. Indeed, the more we attempt to fathom them,—the further we advance into them,—the more marvelous we perceive them to be.

Each fresh advance of science into the realms of the unknown wonders of the universe is hailed as a fresh triumph of man’s mind.

Manifestly, here is a wisdom unfathomed by man,—a wisdom beyond his ken.

A little thought satisfies us that this Earth is not only marvelously constructed in itself, but is also

marvelously adapted to the use to which it has been put,—that of a habitation by man.

It is located at just the right distance from the sun to be neither too cold in winter nor too hot in summer for him to live upon; and it is also warm enough to produce the vegetation required for his support.

The polar regions, still habitable for a few Eskimos, show that but a slight increase in their cold,—added from the frigidity of space,—would render those regions uninhabitable even for Eskimos, and cause their use for man's habitation to cease.

Venus, the nearest planet to us, 25,000,000 miles away, and that much nearer to the sun, is hotter than the Earth. Photographs show her surface to be cracked into huge fissures (Compton's Encyclopedia, p. 2819, Planets). She is shown to be a hot, fissured barren waste, unfitted for human habitation.

Mars, next nearest to us but further out and 49,000,000 miles away, is 49,000,000 miles further from the sun than we; and hence is colder than the Earth.

RELATIVE CLIMATES

Heat, as we all know, diminishes with distance. Scientists tell us that heat radiating from a central heat-giving point or body diminishes with distance,—not *as the distance*, but *inversely as the square of*

the distance. (Elementary Treatise Natural Philosophy, by Deschanel, 13th Edition, p. 179; Physics, by Wentworth and Hall, p. 132; Physics, by Carhart and Chute, p. 292.)

That is to say, if you stand two feet away from the fire and your friend four feet away from it, the heat he receives from it is not one-half as much as you do, but only a quarter as much.

Your distance from the fire is 2 feet. Inversely (or invertedly), that is one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$). One-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) squared, is one-fourth ($\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$).

His distance from the fire is four feet. Inversely, that is one-fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$). One-fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$) squared, is one-sixteenth ($\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{16}$).

According to that law, you are getting one-fourth and he is getting one-sixteenth as much heat from the fire, relatively, one as the other.

One-sixteenth ($\frac{1}{16}$) is a quarter of a fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$).

According to that elementary law of Heat Radiation ("*inversely as the square of the distance*"), with you at two feet from the fire and with him at four feet away from it; he is getting a quarter as much heat from it as you are.

That law of heat radiation is a fact. They have proven it *experimentally*. (Elementary Treatise Natural Philosophy, by Deschanel; Physics, by Wentworth and Hall; and Physics, by Carhart and Chute, *supra*.)

That law is therefore a *scientific fact*,—proven

experimentally;—which, by the way, is carefully to be distinguished from a scientific *theory* (which is an entirely different thing).

Heat radiates from the sun as from a central source or body.

Venus' mean distance from the sun is approximately 67,000,000 miles; the Earth's, 92,000,000; and Mars', 141,000,000. (Compton's Encl. p. 2816.)

If we invert those distances, and then square them, the results will give us the relative degrees of heat received by each of those planets from the sun;—by Venus $\frac{1}{67,000,000 \times 67,000,000}$; by the Earth, $\frac{1}{92,000,000 \times 92,000,000}$; and by Mars, $\frac{1}{141,000,000 \times 141,000,000}$.

Reducing these fractions equally, by discarding their common factors of millionths; and then multiplying them out, we find the relative heat received by Venus is $\frac{1}{4489}$; by the Earth, $\frac{1}{8464}$; and by Mars, $\frac{1}{19,881}$. Reduced to decimals, those fractions show the relative heat received by Venus to be .0002227; by the Earth, .0001181; and by Mars, .0000503, respectively. From those fractions or decimals we can readily see that Venus receives about twice as much heat from the sun as the Earth; and Mars less than half as much.

With about twice the Earth's heat on Venus and less than half the Earth's heat on Mars, it can readily be perceived that Mars is as much too cold for human habitation as Venus is too hot.

"Summer and winter on Mars are nearly twice as long as they are here, and the average temperature is probably below zero, though during the long summer it may go above freezing." (Compton's Encl. p. 2817.)

All of which but goes to show the admirable location of the Earth for its habitation by man.

EARTH'S DEVELOPMENT

Once a ball of fire ("The Earth must at one time have been a mass of molten rock". Compton's Encl. p. 1060, Earth), and then through long ages with its outer crust slowly cooling down and hardening into the basic rock,—the primeval granite of the azoic age (age without life);—and then existing through other long ages, while small particles of that granite crust, comminuted by frost or worn off by rainfall, formed a sand which in turn formed other rocks, whose disintegration later on, with lichens growing on them, formed a soil for other plant-life to grow in; this world of ours gradually developed conditions which admitted of vegetation, of animal life, and finally of life by man.

INGREDIENTS OF SOIL,—WHEN PLANNED?

To fit the Earth's soil to produce the vegetation needed for man's support,—to fit it, for example, to produce wheat (containing most, if not all of the constituents needed to sustain man's body),—it was

necessary that the soil from which that wheat sprang, should itself contain the basic mineral salts needed to produce those constituents in the wheat. For not all soils produce wheat. Some produce none. Some produce a little and then give out (leaving whole areas to be abandoned with their buildings). Others, like the chalk cliffs of Dover, have produced wheat for 1000 years. For that soil to contain those indispensable basic salts, it was necessary that its source, the granite rock, should itself contain them.

And to have those mineral salts in the granite rock, it was necessary that that molten mass, the Earth, of which the granite was the scum, should have contained those salts also. Thus we see that for the Earth's soil to contain those indispensable ingredients for the wheat, it was necessary that the Earth itself,—that liquid mass,—should have been formed with those minerals in it;—when? Yes, when the Earth itself was formed. And must have been planned,—when?

Wheat is but a single instance out of a thousand. Equal preparation was needed to cause the Earth to produce the coal, the oil, and the numberless other constituents of its complete equipment for man and his needs.

We can therefore see the plan of preparing this Earth and its conditions for habitation by man dates back to before the time when the Earth itself was formed.

ANNIHILATION

The crowning product of this world is man;—and of man, the choicest jewel is that unseen but controlling ‘something’ within him which thinks, feels, loves, decides and guides his thought and actions,—called his spirit.

The chief gem of Earth, is, therefore, the spirit of man.

If man’s spirit does not live after its body dies,—if man’s spirit perishes with his body,—of what use becomes all that vast ages-long preparation of this Earth in all those countless ways for its habitation by man? Of what use becomes all that fine adjustment of climate; that age-long preparation of soil from the granite and that molten mass to raise a vegetation to support his life? Would we not have here the exercise of a surpassing wisdom, continued through countless ages in the preparation and adaptation of the Earth for its crowning use,—to be a garden for the growth of man,—and of man himself,—to be a cradle for the growth and development of spirit,—utterly wasted, if that crowning use were thus all to lapse into nothingness?

If the spirit of man,—the crowning gem of this whole preparation,—were, on the dissolution of its container, its body, to lapse into nothing, where then would be the use of all that vast wonderful preparation and adaptation of this world for man to live upon?

Would not the net result of it all be,—like a child's soap bubble,—beautiful in its iridescence while it lasts and then, dissolution into thin air?

With that ultimate and crowning product of all that vast preparation and adaptation annihilated, what then would that whole preparation and development of the Earth for man and of man for spirit, amount to?

A FOOL?

If we saw a human being engaged in such a process, spending countless ages of time, of thought, of effort, of energy, and of power;—achieving so much, —such marvelous results along so many lines;—and then producing, as a consummation of it all, the annihilation of his final product;—what would we say of such an one? Would we not pronounce him,—and rightly pronounce him,—a fool?

THE ALMIGHTY

With such wonderful wisdom displayed on every hand in the world itself and outside of it in the universe beyond,—as noted by the scientists, throughout the distant orbs in the heavens and down to the tiniest atoms on Earth (with their revolving electrons circling round their central protons, just as the planets circle round the sun),—can anyone conceive that such a condemnatory term as that could be applicable to the Almighty Ruler of the universe?

In other words, is it conceivable that the Almighty is, with this Earth and the human race, only engaged,—like a child,—in blowing bubbles?

CHARGE THE ALMIGHTY WITH FOLLY?

Being unable to perceive disembodied spirits, and therefore being unable to detect their presence or their absence, and consequently being unable to detect them even if present all about us; and having therefore no tangible or visible proof of the non-existence of spirits after their bodies die (for they may exist for aught you or I or anyone else knows, all around us, or elsewhere), how can we, by claiming that the spirit,—the highest, the final, the crowning product of this Earth,—is annihilated (when we have absolutely no evidence whatever upon which to base such a claim) venture to thus *charge the Almighty with folly?*

Unless we are prepared to do that,—to charge the confessedly all-wise and Almighty One with folly (and that without a particle of evidence to sustain the charge),—how can it be claimed that the spirit of man,—the crowning output of this Earth,—is annihilated when its body drops off?

IS IT COMMON SENSE?

Is it scientific,—is it logical,—is it reasonable,—is it common sense, to make a statement without a particle of evidence to base it on?

When all is said and done, is such a statement, unsupported by any evidence whatever, anything more than a mere theory;—and a wild, unsubstantiated theory at that?

A 'SOMETHING'

Most thoughtful people recognize in man a 'something' more than just the flesh, blood and bone of his physical body. Besides those they realize that in him exists a 'something' that largely controls that flesh, blood and bone of his body; that says to his hand, "Do this", and it does it; and to his feet, "Carry me thither", and thither they go.

Especially is that fact of a 'something' within his body, evidenced by his tongue,—which voices aloud the various thoughts, feelings, and decisions of that 'something' within.

That 'something' within him which directs and largely controls his body, they have called his spirit.

SEPARATE FROM THE BODY

Furthermore, thoughtful people usually realize that that spirit of man is something separate from his body. Thus, if you cut off a hand or a foot from his body, while that mutilates his body, it does not mutilate his spirit. He is still the same man as before;—he still thinks, feels and speaks as before. His body is mutilated,—but his spirit is not. No matter how badly his body may be mutilated, his spirit

remains intact. Of this fact the late U. S. Senator Alexander H. Stevens was a striking illustration. A cripple all his life, having to be wheeled in and out of the Senate Chamber all the days of his membership, his spirit, uncrippled, was a commanding power there. Though crippled in body, his spirit was not.

Cut off, if you please, both hands and both feet, both arms and both legs, leaving the physical man but a stump;—and still his spirit remains unchanged. He is the same man still. He still thinks, feels, and decides as before. Though maimed in body, his spirit is not maimed. In brief, lopping off parts of his body, does not lop off parts of his spirit.

Is it not therefore apparent that mutilating the body does not mutilate the spirit; and that man's spirit, that 'something' within him, is thus separate from the body containing it?

DISTINCT

Men differ;—and in nothing as much as in their words and acts.

Though losing arms and legs, they continue the same, identical men, unaltered in spirit; retaining the same thoughts, feelings, and differences of opinion as before.

If time is taken to consider it, most people seem to arrive at the conclusion that the essential man,—the controlling thing in man,—the man himself,—is

not his body; but is that 'something' within him which thinks, feels and largely guides his body and his acts, called his spirit.

If this body of his is lacerated, or wounded, his spirit is aware of it (as it is of most all that affects his body), senses it, feels badly or hurt about it, and suffers accordingly. But if his spirit is wounded, as by words unkindly spoken (as is done about us daily), while his body may hear the words passing through its ears, it does not sense the wound suffered by his spirit, nor does it suffer from those words. The spoken words often produce no effect whatever upon his body. Does this not indicate that his spirit is something separate from his body?

Then there is the whole exclusive realm of his spirit,—its thoughts, aspirations, decisions, resolutions and longings,—as well as the whole gamut of its affections and emotions,—in fact, the chief life of his spirit,—of which the body is utterly ignorant. His body simply knows nothing at all about those things which are the essence of his spirit's life. They have almost no effect whatever upon his body. Does it not therefore appear that the spirit of man is a 'something' separate and apart from his body?

Obviously his spirit is superior to his body. The body does not direct and control itself. It is largely directed and controlled by the spirit. Is it not then manifest that the spirit is something quite distinct from the body?

LAW COURTS RECOGNIZE SPIRIT AS DISTINCT

A striking recognition of man's spirit being distinct from his body is given in our law courts. They recognize that a man's body, apart from his spirit cooperating, cannot commit a crime such as murder and the like. As once expressed by an advocate in court, "This hand of mine alone cannot commit murder. If this hand of mine kills a man, that is not murder, unless my will cooperates."

The law courts thus recognize in crimes like murder, that guilt and innocence depend, not upon the action of a man's flesh, blood and bone body, but upon the action of his spirit within that body,—without which his body cannot commit those crimes. The law courts thus recognize man's spirit to be controlling and to be something separate and distinct from his body.

From all of which is it not manifest that the spirit of man,—his inner, controlling self,—is indeed something quite distinct from his flesh, blood and bone body?

MAN A SPIRIT

In fine, when we come right down to it, is it not evident that man, the essential man, is not a flesh, blood and bone body; but is a spirit within that body? Man, then, in the last analysis, is a spirit.

THE CREATOR, A SPIRIT

A Creator is superior to the thing or creature He creates.

As man, His crowning creature, has, it is submitted, a spirit; and is, it is submitted, essentially a spirit,—the controlling factor in his being; it is submitted that his Creator therefore necessarily possesses a spirit also, and is a Spirit. Were it not so, God, the Creator, would be inferior to His creature, man: which is inconceivable,—impossible. God therefore has, and is a spirit.

HE HAS THE POWER

Having done the greater thing and created spirits with bodies, who will deny that the Ruler of the universe has power to do the lesser thing,—to create spirits without bodies? The greater includes the less.

And having thus the power to create such spirits,—spirits without bodies,—what is to prevent His putting such a spirit into a body? Confessedly nothing. And if that body wears out or disintegrates, what limits the Infinite Ruler of the universe from letting or causing that spirit, released from its temporary body, to live on, just as it had been living before He encased it in flesh?—just the same as if that spirit had never been put in a human body? Confessedly nothing.

Having then the power to create spirits without physical bodies; to encase them in flesh, and then to

let them live on after losing their envelopes of flesh; what is to hinder the Almighty One from creating spirits in physical bodies to continue living on after their physical bodies wear out or drop off?—that is, when freed from those physical bodies? Confessedly nothing.

What is there to prevent the Almighty, if He chooses, from causing the spirit of man to survive the destruction of His earthly body? Nothing,—absolutely nothing.

Indeed, what evidence have we that He has not done that very thing?—that He has not caused human spirits living in their envelopes of flesh and blood to live on after their earthly bodies have dropped off? None. There is absolutely no evidence to the contrary.

To create spirits to live on after their bodies fall off, lies then, absolutely within the power of the Almighty;—does it not? He has power to create embodied spirits to survive their mortal bodies. That is so, is it not?

WHICH HAS HE DONE?

When, as we have seen, to create those embodied spirits to die with their bodies, would be to annihilate the entire output of this, His so wonderfully constituted and adapted world,—and be an act of supreme folly, the action of a fool; and when we see and know that the Infinite Creator is supremely

wise,—is the embodiment of wisdom; how can He be imagined guilty of such folly?

With no evidence to the contrary, does not all the evidence before us go to show that He has not committed that folly, and hence has caused man's spirit to survive its body?

It is submitted that all the facts and all the evidence in our possession are opposed to the spirit dying when the body dies; and are in favor of the spirit surviving its human home. There is no evidence to the contrary.

WHICH MORE REASONABLE?

With absolutely unrestricted power to do this thing, and with absolutely no evidence whatever that He has not done it, which is more reasonable to believe, that, supremely wise throughout the universe,—wise beyond our ken,—He has acted wisely in this important particular also and caused man's spirit to survive;—or to believe that He has caused the annihilation of His final product, destroyed the work of His hands, and committed this act of folly,—the action of a fool?

Is not to ask that question to answer it?

WHAT ONLY REASONABLE CONCLUSION?

In a word, from all the evidence before us, and from all the *lack* of evidence before us, is not the only reasonable conclusion that, wise in all else throughout

the universe, and wise in all other particulars on this planet, He has also exercised His same infinite wisdom in this last remaining particular, and hence has imparted to man's spirit a surviving life?

PROOF?

Is there proof of a Life Beyond?

Were there no Life Beyond for man's spirit,—were man's spirit to die with its body,—and Earth's final product thus to be annihilated, that, as we have seen, would make of this Earth, its ages-long preparation and of its output, a stupendous folly.

The Almighty is the embodiment of Wisdom. Wisdom is His attribute and rule of action. In the universe and world about us, we see that to Him folly is unknown,—is an impossibility. Therefore, to prevent the annihilation of His age-long work and its reduction to a futility, He needs must have imparted to the spirit of man a Life Beyond. Other than that He could not, in wisdom, do. That was an inevitable sequence to His wisdom,—a necessity,—and an adjunct,—to it.

OFFSHOOT OF ALMIGHTY'S WISDOM

Indeed, when we come to consider it, is not a Life Beyond, in point of fact, an inevitably resulting outgrowth of the wisdom of the Almighty? For did man's spirit not survive, the Almighty's work upon this Earth would be futile. His wisdom therefore

demanding, necessitated, compelled, a Life Beyond for man. A Life Beyond for man is therefore an indispensable consequence of man's existence and of God's wisdom;—in brief, it is an offshoot of His wisdom,—is part and parcel of it. Is not that so? It, therefore, cannot be otherwise than that the future holds in store for man, a Life Beyond.

The future of man's spirit is, therefore, assured.

A FACT. CERTAINTY ITSELF

Being part and parcel of the wisdom of the Almighty, it is submitted that a Life Beyond is, in reality, a fact;—is just as much a fact as is that wisdom itself, of which it is a part. And hence that a Life Beyond is just as much a fact as any other fact in the universe;—as that the sun shines, or that the wind blows.

Hence, it is submitted, that the Life Beyond is just as certain as the wisdom of the Almighty is certain. That is certainty itself,—is it not?

WHAT OUR PROOF?

What, then, is our proof of a Life Beyond?

The wisdom of the Almighty, everywhere else disclosed, of which the Life Beyond is an adjunct and a part and parcel,—an unavoidable offshoot,—that wisdom precludes its being otherwise; precludes there being in the future, other than a Life Beyond for man.

What firmer foundation could a Life Beyond have, or what stronger proof could we have of it,—to live by, and to die by,—than that it is wrapped up in, and is an unavoidable part and parcel of the wisdom of the Almighty?

In a word, our proof of a Life Beyond lies in the fact that the Almighty,—with reverence be it spoken,—is *no fool*.

Just as sure as is the wisdom of the Almighty, just so sure is there a Life Beyond for man.

As surely as there is an all-wise God above us,—as is proven by His well-known works of wisdom all about us,—just so surely an added life awaits man in the Beyond.

*

*

*

III

IN LIGHT OF

THINGS AS THEY ARE

WHY ARE SIN AND SUFFERING

PERMITTED IN THE WORLD?

Why
Are Sin and Suffering
Permitted?

III

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF THINGS AS THEY ARE,—
WHY ARE SIN AND SUFFERING PERMITTED
IN THE WORLD?

With an all-wise, all-powerful and all-loving God ruling in the universe, why is it that sin and suffering are permitted in the world?

That is a question of the ages.

Not long ago that question was voiced from a leading platform, and again but the other day from a pulpit, as being still an open question,—one of the mysteries.

MEASURED BY HIS LIFE-PRODUCT, WHAT,
ESSENTIALLY, IS A MAN?

Some years ago I was seated in a restaurant in New York City looking out upon the street. I was thinking, Measured by the product of her life what, essentially, is a cow?

All her life long she produces milk.

Measured by her life-product, is not a cow, in reality, a *living* milk-producing machine?

Measured by his life-product, what is a man, essentially?

What is the product of a man's life?

He enters the world a spirit; he leaves it a spirit also, but a spirit,—changed.

Is not the product of a man's life that change wrought in his nature,—in his spirit,—while here? Is it not that difference between the spirit that entered the world and the spirit that leaves it?

Measured by his life-product what, essentially, is a man? Is he not, essentially, a *spirit-changing* machine?

Is not that a fact? Is not that change, inwrought into his spirit while here, his life-product? Is not man then, in reality, a living *spirit-changing* machine?

BEGINNING OF SIN IN THE WORLD

When a baby enters the world it likes sugar, and at the table reaches for it. It does not matter to the baby whose sugar it is; that is all the same to him. He takes the sugar, eats it. He does not yet know the difference between mine and thine. Later, when some sugar is given him, he is told that *that* sugar is his own and he may eat it; but that other sugar

belongs to some one else, and that he must not touch. To take it is forbidden and is wrong.

Still liking sugar and seeing no difference in sugars, the baby again reaches for his neighbor's sugar. His hand is punished accordingly.

Later, when older, he is told that to take what belongs to others is wrong, is stealing, and is a sin.

His appetite for sugar still remaining unchanged and stronger than the injunction not to take it, he again takes his neighbor's sugar. And here have we not, for the baby, the beginning of sin in the world?

A CRAVING OF THE ETERNAL

Is it not conceivable that the Creator, the all-loving God who loves all His creatures, living in solitary grandeur above, should after a while have desired some one to love Him in return for the love He was lavishing upon all?

Angels loved Him.

He could have created man on Earth to love Him. Had He done so, what kind of a love would that have been? Would it not have been but a created love,—a reflection of His own creative will? Would not that love have been but the love of an automaton?

Would that have been a spontaneous love?

Is it conceivable that such a love,—such a mere figment of love,—such a mere reflected love,—could have satisfied the great loving heart of the Eternal?

Does it not seem reasonable that He should have

desired,—craved,—yes, yearned for the love of some creature who would, of its own accord, love Him for Himself,—spontaneously? Is not that the kind of love any loving heart would desire? Would any loving heart be satisfied with anything less?

THE PROBLEM

But in a universe where all beings in it were created by Him, how was it possible to have an independent, spontaneous love? As every being in it would be as He created it, how was it possible to have in it a being who loved Him of its own accord,—spontaneously? Would not the love of all creatures in the universe be but reflections of His own creative will,—be but created loves?

That was the problem. If there was a loving creature in the universe, that creature must have been created by Him. How then could it love except as it had been created to love? Hence, how could its love be anything but a reflected love,—the love of a puppet?

Who would be satisfied with such a love? Would the great heart of the Eternal?

To that problem, was there any solution?

ANY WAY OUT?

For that quandary, was there any way out?

Was there any way but one?

Was there any other way but to create a being

capable of loving or of not loving, as it pleased,—with a free will to love or to hate as it chose;—and then for Him *to win* the love of that being? Is not that the only kind of a being who could love Him for Himself,—of its own accord,—spontaneously? And is not that the only way in which it was possible to have such a being exist, and to have such a love flowing out, of its own free will,—of its own accord, spontaneously, toward Him?

Obviously, then, to have beings exercising a spontaneous love, they must be created with a capacity to love or to hate; and with a will free to do either, as they chose; in short, beings free to choose between right and wrong, between loving and hating? Is not that so?

To ask the question seems to answer it.

And the moment that question is answered, and beings are thus created with a capacity to love or to hate and a free will to do either, and are then left to themselves to choose between the right and the wrong, between loving and hating; why have we not here the origin of desires to overstep the bounds of right and also of the overstepping of those bounds;—and thus the origin of sin and of its inevitable attendant,—suffering,—in the world?

SPONTANEOUS LOVE

If we follow the baby a little further we find as he grows older, that just as he learned the sin of

taking what did not belong to him, he learns the sin of other things. He is punished for doing them, and suffers accordingly.

Later when he comes to the age of discretion,—to the age of choosing in life between right and wrong,—to the age when perhaps he may give himself to that all-loving and all-wise Father who reigns above and loves him;—that he chooses the right and gives himself to Him, to be His son. Before that, wrong-doing, sin, had met with punishment,—suffering,—the inevitable consequence of sin. And after that, sin still met with punishment, but with this difference, that now he was being helped to keep on the side of right by trying, with aid given him from above as he asked for it, to walk in his Father's way.

How is it possible to teach a little child who comes into the world with the moral sense, but undeveloped and untrained, to choose the right and shun the wrong except (after the right has been explained to him) by punishing him for wrong-doing? It is submitted there is no other way.

And so wrong-doing along all lines bears the bitter fruit of punishment,—of suffering. But through it all and from it all, the sufferer learns the bitterness of the evil way; and that following the right is better.

Thus going through life, he gradually tends, if his will is on that side, to do the right and shun the

wrong. And thus, with help from above, his nature is gradually formed.

As he grows up, by a divinely created capacity he learns to love one of his own race, whom he later takes to be his mate. Thus he learns to love one of his own kind and to love spontaneously.

To them children are born, who bring love with them into the world; and thus by them also he learns to love of his own accord, spontaneously.

Through the bible and the teachings of Christ, if possessed of them (the only written revelations in the world of God's love), he learns of that love, and gradually learns to love Him in return, and to do His will. And thus do we not see, produced before our eyes, an independent being choosing the right and of its own free will choosing to love,—spontaneously,—the Father above;—a creature who, so far as we can see, could have been produced in no other way?

BY-PRODUCTS

Is not the reason that sin and suffering are permitted in the world, that they are the unavoidable by-products of the creation of beings endowed with freedom of will, who enter this world with no knowledge of right and wrong, save the conscience with which the Father above has endowed each one of us, and who are then left to themselves to develop,—with His help as asked for,—their independent

spirits into such natures as their choices for good or for evil and their actions may lead them to grow into?

MINIATURES OF THE MOST HIGH

Are not sin (original Greek, "a missing of the mark") and its attendant, suffering, the unavoidable accompaniments of independent beings who are forming their natures here differently from those with which they entered the world;—forming, through their mistakes and successes, natures of their own developing; and who thus are the architects,—and it may even be the artists,—of those changing natures; that is to say, artists not in perishing marble or bronze, but,—if the right is chosen,—artists in spirit, destined it may be to exist eternally,—and thus to become ultimately what? Even,—with bated breath be it spoken,—miniatures of their Father; that is to say, when developed, matured and perfected, destined to become improved counterparts of their first original creation, of which it was written, "in the image of God created he him" (Genesis 1:27, R. V.), and of whom it was later said by that all-wise Master-Teacher and Example of all time, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." (Matthew 5:48, R. V.)

What a future!

What could compare with the life that is thus opened up to each one of us?—To grow into His

likeness! To become a miniature of The Most High! To live in His joy and in His love;—in a joy unspeakable and in an ocean of love;—a life comparable only to that of the Eternal, Himself!

We live in a marvelous world,—in a marvelous universe. And we have a marvelous Creator and God.

What transcending possibilities has He not placed before each of us,—His children!

Is not life with such an outlook, with such possibilities, with such a future, spite of all hardships, trials and suffering here, more than worth while?

And that joy and delight are to last for how long? Yes, forever.

THE ANSWER

Is not then the answer to the question why are sin and suffering permitted in the world, that they are unavoidable by-products of the growth in the world of sons and daughters of the Most High?—and of the creating for them of joys eternal, in which “they shall reign forever and ever”? (Revelation 22:5, R. V.)

*
* *

IV

IN LIGHT OF
THINGS AS THEY ARE
WHAT REGARDING
'THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE'?

EVERY once in a while some one of our scientists,—usually of our theoretical scientists,—refers to ‘The Riddle of the Universe’,—but without giving us any explanation or solution of it.

The universe is still full of unexplored marvelous mysteries, yielding, nevertheless, slowly to the patient, persistent efforts of our practical scientists.

IV

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF THINGS AS THEY ARE,—
REGARDING ‘THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE’?

What is it all about? What are all those circling planets doing, and all those many stars? What are they accomplishing? What are they there for?

That is ‘The Riddle of the Universe’,—is it not?

We know very little about the stars or even about the other planets, compared with what we know about the Earth.

Is not the first step, therefore, toward solving ‘The Riddle of the Universe’, to solve ‘The Riddle of the Earth’?

‘THE RIDDLE OF THE EARTH’

What, indeed, is this Earth of ours doing? What is it accomplishing, as it circles ceaselessly around the sun? What is it here for?

We have seen the Earth's chief use is being a habitation for man,—an abode for him to live upon;—and of thus being a garden for the race (see, "What of a Life Beyond?"). And the chief use of man, we have seen, is to furnish a cradle for the growth and development of spirit. (*Ibid.*)

We have further seen that man,—the essential man,—enters upon this Earth a spirit, and leaves it, a spirit also;—but a spirit changed (see, "Why are Sin and Suffering Permitted in the World?").

That change is wrought in man's spirit,—in his inner nature,—by the life each leads upon the Earth. And in that resultant change in spirit,—the difference between what his spirit was when it entered life and what it is when it leaves it,—consists the effect of the Earth-life upon his spirit. That is what the Earth has wrought in that spirit. That is what the Earth is doing.

WHAT IS THAT CHANGE?

What is that change?

When man enters life on earth, he enters it a helpless babe in his mother's arms,—but a spirit nevertheless.

What is the nature of that spirit?

Consider children, when old enough to express their wants and wishes. What do we find them to be? Attractive, lovely, winsome little creatures, winning love from those about them,—especially

from those caring for their helplessness;—but what do we find them to be? Are they themselves loving?

Do children think first of others and then of themselves; or do they think first of themselves? Others think first of them and for them; but do children think first even for those who are caring for them and then for themselves? Is not to ask that question, to answer it? Do not children always think first of themselves and for themselves,—for their wants and wishes,—and then for others; if, indeed, they think for others at all? Consider young children, and then answer the question.

Where do we find children putting others first and themselves last? Possibly a few may, but how is it with the great mass of children? Do they not want their needs and wishes supplied and supplied first? Do they not want their own way,—and want it first?

Of course much depends upon their bringing up; but the children we need to consider are the great mass of children when they are first old enough to express themselves;—before they have had sufficient training to alter their natural selves;—that is, children in their natural state.

When the baby is hungry, does it not cry?—or does it forego crying and hunger to let its mother sleep on?

Is not to ask the question to answer it?

The baby has no one else to care for than itself;

and that it tries to do. That is its first thought, and practically its only thought. Its needs and wants claim its first and sole attention. Thinking of oneself first, and only of and for oneself, is what is usually called being selfish. The baby then, judged by ordinary standards, is selfish;—is it not? The baby loves its mother, but loves her because she supplies its wants. That is the cause of the baby's affection for its mother. Apart from that the baby is selfish,—like a little animal. And that love for its mother is a selfish love,—is a love because of what it gets from its mother. It differs from the mother's love for the baby, which loves the baby, not for what it gets from the child, but for what it can give to the child;—for the good of the child. Hers is an unselfish love.

As the child grows a little older, that trait, as a rule, develops more and more. The general run of young children, excepting perhaps a few of those better brought up, are selfish;—as can be perceived if we watch them. Notice children playing in the street. Are their chief objectives "You", "Yours", "Your way"; or are they "I", "Mine", "My way"?

You say that is natural; and so it is. It is just letting their natural selves express themselves. But that expression of each for itself, is selfish,—is it not?

Is it not a fact, then, that children, when they

enter life on the Earth, are selfish little lovely creatures; thinking only of and for themselves;—like little animals? I think you will agree they are.

WHAT DOES EARTH-LIFE DO TO CHILDREN?

What does the Earth-life do to children?

Reared in a home, with a mother's love making it home, as they grow older, some of them learn to love that mother for more than just what they get from her. When they see her spending herself unremittingly for them, some of them learn to want to help her in her ceaseless round of toil, and try to help her, who is all the time doing for them. And so a sympathetic love,—an unselfish love,—starts like a spark in their natures; and they take their first step in loving unselfishly,—in doing something for some one else from sympathy, from an unselfish love for that one;—just the opposite of selfishness. That step is taken more often among children of the poor where mothers are making greater sacrifices for their children;—which the children see.

As they grow older, some of them find some one whom they like, and they have a companion,—a chum. They walk together; talk together; share their ideas and little pleasures; confide in each other; grow nearer to each other; grow more companionable; and finally have an affection for one another.

Some of those better-off also respond. Thus, in

days gone by, the eldest son of a good sized family, starting out in youth to make his way in the world at \$1 a day, saved his first earnings and with them bought a brooch for his mother;—token of his love for her, in appreciation for all she had done for him;—a token she was proud to wear.

Later in life many of them find some one with whom they seem to be in sweet accord. They join lives and live together. Out of those alliances come joys and sorrows, hardships and pleasures, and usually children, bringing with them into the world a tender spot in their parents' hearts;—a tender feeling from fathers and a devoted love from mothers; both tending to the same result,—a love for his or her boy or girl. All this tends to develop in fathers and mothers a love, not for themselves, but for some one else. With the finer natures, its results are deep, strong, transforming.

FATHER'S LOVE,—SON'S LOVE

In the Morro Castle horror, where more than 120 were burned to death or drowned, a father, mother and son, after battling seven hours with rough waves, were rescued. At the investigation following, the father was asked:

“Q.—You both” (meaning he and his wife) “had life preservers?”

"A.—Yes. *My son gave me his.* He told me he had another one; *but he didn't.* If I'd known that, *I never would have taken it.*" (Morro Castle Investigation, *New York Herald-Tribune*, Sept. 12, 1934, p. 13, col. 4.) (Italics by compiler.)

Other products of Earth-life there are, just the opposite,—produced in those following the opposite course, who develop the worst traits known to man. Those are the failures in life. Yet even in those are sparks of redeeming traits. They are not wholly bad. They are one kind of Earth's product, but not the best or only kind. They seem to be an unavoidable by-product in the process of Earth's school,—but they are not its chief product.

A WONDERFUL PRODUCT

Obviously, the Earth is a school.

What are the chief lessons taught there? Love from its very beginnings, through all its varied stages, in all its various forms and to all its various degrees. Is not that so? Some of it is pure, unselfish love of the finest type. Consider mother-love. Is not its quality superbly fine? Is not such love one of the highest prized products known to man? Again, I say, Consider mother-love.

That chief process of Earth-life,—that schooling in love,—is going on at all times, in all lands, among all peoples, ignorant or civilized, and in the distant

islands of the sea. And the gains, the advances made,—the tender spots created in father-hearts and the devoted loves in mother-hearts,—are *the products* of Earth's school. That gain in the natures of men and women,—that love,—is the product of their schooling in Earth's school,—a wonderful product,—is it not?

LIFE, A GARNERING TIME

The progress each is making in Life's School,—in engrafting into his nature Earth's lessons of love,—is, to some extent, marked upon each. Notice the unconscious expression of his countenance when at rest; his actions, and his unconscious smile;—all outward indications, to some extent, of his acquisitions,—of his inward progress,—in Earth's schooling; which, by his acceptance and practice, are being inwrought into his nature, and are thereby being made his own.

Life, as we pass through it, has stored up on either side our way, treasures galore; each inestimable; and each within the reach of all. They are open to all. They may be had for the taking. He takes who will. Some emerge from the Earth-life nabobs, with wealth beyond wildest dreams, resplendent!—with natures loving, lovely, and beloved by multitudes. Others there are, equally so, but known only to a few. Still others emerge paupers. In money? No.

They may be millionaires, but in their natures,—in their spirits,—they are cold, hard, destitute of love, clothed in rags. Each gets what he takes. All is free to all. Life is a sowing, reaping, garnering time.

NOT A PAMPERED PRODUCT

The Earth is accounted a selfish world, and so in many ways it is. It is a hard place for love to grow in. That means that love grown there can probably survive anywhere. It is the genuine article. It is not a pampered, hot-house product; but a vital living motive in men's and women's natures, kindling by its contact, love in others. It is self-propagating. Love begets love.

A MIGHTY OUTPUT

What, then, is Earth's output?

Measured in terms of its chief product, love; in pure, unselfish love; in love in all its various degrees and in all its many attractive forms;—what is Earth's output?

The Earth's population has been estimated at about 1,600 millions,—a billion six hundred million. That means over 500 million (over half a billion) mothers in a single generation.

How great is a mother's love?

MOTHER-LOVE

Consider mother-love,—the love of but a single mother. What is its quality? Is there anything human that is finer,—purer? Humanly, who can improve upon its quality? And what is its extent?—Boundless; is it not? Who can measure a single mother's love?

Multiply that mother-love by 500 million,—that is, by half a billion,—times. How great are they all combined? Who can measure them? Their total baffles imagination;—does it not? That is Earth's output in Mother-love in every generation,—in less than each century. What a mighty output in Mother-love!

But that is not all. There are also Father-loves; noble, self-sacrificing Father-loves. Who can measure the love of that father, who, had he known his son had no other life preserver, would "never have taken it" of him? What is the measure of that love? And how many Father-loves are there? Perhaps an equal number,—500 million,—half a billion fathers in each generation. That is a mighty output in Father-love also! Is it not?

And there are loving lives of young men also;—noble, loving, self-sacrificing lives;—often cut short in youth before their prime. How many of these are there? Who can count them?

And of noble loving maidens too, who pass on in youth;—how many of them are there also? Who can say?

Are not those, each, a mighty host?—and their total, is it not stupendous, overwhelming? Half a billion Mother-loves; half a billion Father-loves; besides unnumbered loves of young men and maidens!

Those overwhelming harvests are Earth's output in but a single generation,—in less than each 100 years.

And there have been how many generations in the past? Who can say? And there are still how many more generations yet to come? Nobody knows. Who can measure Earth's output?

That is what the Earth is doing, is accomplishing, as it circles ceaselessly round the sun.

Is not the answer, then, to 'The Riddle of the Earth', that it is engaged in producing on a stupendous scale the choicest, rarest, most highly prized product known to man?

WHAT OF HIS OTHER GARDENS?

There is but a single Ruler of the universe,—only one God. If, in endeavoring to solve the wonders of His universe, we find He has put one of the least of all His many gardens,—the one with which alone we are somewhat acquainted,—to the growth of the choicest product known to man, may we not, relying upon His identical nature dealing similarly with His other gardens, rest confidently assured that He is putting them also to uses equally lofty, attractive and beneficent?

WHAT ANSWER?

What answer, then, shall we make to 'The Riddle of the Universe'?

Is it not, that finding the all-wise, all-powerful Ruler of the universe has devoted one of the least of all His gardens to the growth of the choicest of all spirit products known to man; and relying upon His identical nature dealing similarly with His other gardens, we are satisfied,—nay, convinced,—that He is putting His other gardens to like uses, or if it be possible, to uses even more lofty, attractive and beneficent (if there be such, and who shall say there are not?); and hence that He has and is devoting them also to the growth of the choicest products known in spirit-life?

Are we not justified in that conclusion?

And if we are,—and it is submitted that we are,—why does not that answer the question, What are all those circling planets doing, and all those many stars?—What are they accomplishing? What are they there for?

Why is not that the Answer to 'The Riddle of the Universe'?

INCIDENTALLY

And incidentally, to what finer, loftier or more attractive purpose could they possibly have been put than that?

And toward what type of spirit does not that indicate that most inhabitants of the universe are tending?

Incidentally also, what kind of a nature does not all that indicate,—nay, disclose,—in the Ruler of the universe,—in the Author of it all,—Author of Love?

A QUESTION

If the entire universe is devoted to imparting to spirits that highest of all attributes, Love, the question suggests itself, what need then have we of religion, whose objective is the same;—the growth of love in the soul ("Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart" . . . and "thy neighbor as thyself"—Matthew 22:37-39, R.V.)? Why is not religion superfluous? Why may it not be dispensed with and life be lived as well without it,—as the so-called 'worldlings' live it,—if the goals of both are the same?

All may reach that goal of Love,—of learning to love. It is to be hoped all will. But how long,—what ages, what future existences here or elsewhere,—may it not require for the slow process of hard knocks in daily life (without religion) to accomplish that result in the natures of crooks and criminals, and transform them into loving, law-abiding citizens;—who can tell or forecast? For obviously

a single lifetime in Earth's slow schooling of hard knocks alone (without religion) does not suffice to accomplish that result in them;—for where do we find that result accomplished in crooks and criminals in a single Earth-life here without religion? And therefore, if they are to be reformed by that slow method of hard knocks alone, obviously that would require more than a single Earth-life.

But if religion can accomplish that result in a single lifetime; as it obviously did in the case of Jerry McAuley, former river thief and some say worse, and as it has also accomplished in countless other lives,—which facts are well known and established;—why is not religion,—true religion,—religion of the heart,—*a short cut* to that desired goal of Love and right living?

And if there is a short cut to loving,—why is it not best to take that short cut? Why take a long cut? For is not the short cut better?

In matters secular, all who pass through life, even the most ignorant and least favored, gain some degree of education by dint of life's hard knocks. On the other hand, students at school acquire more knowledge in less time. Schooling is a short cut to knowledge. Which course in secular life is to be preferred,—the short cut or the long? Who would advise discarding the short cut of schooling to take the long cut of a lifetime of hard knocks? For is not the short cut better?

And so in learning to love and live happily, even if both the long cut and the short cut have the same goal in view, which is it better to take,—the long or the short cut? Who that is wise would recommend discarding the short cut of religion to take the long cut of an unknown number of existences of hard knocks? For is not the short cut better?

And therefore, far from dispensing with the short cut of religion, is not that the very course to choose, follow and hug tightly to our breast, as one of God's best gifts to man?

*

* *

V

IN LIGHT OF
THINGS AS THEY ARE
WHAT IN THAT LIFE BEYOND?—
HEAVEN ITSELF?

Satisfied that a Life Beyond
Exists for Man,
What does it Hold In It
For Him?—
Heaven Itself?

V

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF THINGS AS THEY ARE,—
WHAT IN THAT LIFE BEYOND?—
HEAVEN ITSELF?

We have seen that the Earth-life is a schooling in love,—in learning to love under difficulties,—for billions of human beings (see, “The Riddle of the Universe”).

We have seen the Earth-school turns out graduates of all kinds and grades; some, ideals, resplendent; and others,—from that grade down to the lowest known.

We have seen that for man there is a Life Beyond (see, “What of a Life Beyond?”); and the question naturally arises, what is there in that Life Beyond for man?

In the Earth-life, among those choosing the upward path, there is progress; and among those

choosing the downward way, there is progress also, —but downwards.

Progress, therefore, during the Earth-life, seems to be a law of man's being. There is no standing still. It is advance,—either upwards or downwards. Progress, then, in some direction seems to be an inherent element of man's nature.

We have seen if all life ended with Earth-life;—if man's spirit died with his body and Earth-life thus ended in annihilation,—that that would make of the Earth and its output, a folly; and would reduce the infinite wisdom of the Creator, in that particular, —with reverence be it spoken,—to the folly of a fool; a thing impossible in Him or for Him; and hence that a Life Beyond must and does exist for man, in accordance with the universal wisdom of the Creator everywhere else displayed (See, "What of a Life Beyond?").

If now Earth's output, instead of being wholly annihilated by death of the spirit, were partially annihilated by death of an essential part of that spirit,—its inherent element of progress,—which would make of the Life Beyond but a continuing existence of Earth's imperfect product with all possibility of improvement gone,—how far superior in principle would that partial annihilation of spirit be, to its total annihilation;—leaving, as it would, Earth's product to exist throughout eternity a fossilized mass of imperfections?

Where progress is possible,—and who will deny the Almighty's power to prolong that inherent element of progress in man's nature with the rest of his spirit of which it is a part?—where progress is thus possible, would not the annihilation of that essential element in his imperfect nature,—the only hope for his future,—which would leave man to exist a fossilized imperfection,—be just as much an act of folly, *in principle*, as would be the annihilation of his entire spirit? What difference in principle is there between annihilating the whole and annihilating that essential part? The only difference is in degree,—is it not? In the one case all is annihilated; in the other an essential part. In principle, it is submitted, they are in reality the same. That is so,—is it not? One would be as much an act of folly as the other. Is not that so?

And if the annihilation of that spirit of progress in man's nature would, in principle, be as much an act of folly as the annihilation of his entire spirit, then, it is submitted, such an act as the annihilation of that essential part of his nature,—the element of progress,—would be just as incompatible with the inherent, all-pervading wisdom of the All-Wise One as the annihilation of man's entire spirit;—and hence be equally an impossibility for the Eternal. That is so,—is it not?

Moreover, it would be a self-imposed barrier to the attainment of His presumable objective for man,

—perfection,—and hence be a self-stultification on His part;—also an impossibility in Him, or for Him, the All-Wise, All-Powerful Ruler of the universe;—just as much an impossibility as would be the annihilation of man's entire spirit. Is not that so?

Indeed, such a continuance in the Life Beyond of Earth's mixed imperfect output, fossilized, would be a condition worse than that on Earth; for it would mean a continuance in the Life Beyond of Earth's mass of imperfections existing fossilized throughout eternity,—with all hope of improvement *gone*. To annihilate the spirit of progress would therefore be a step backward for the race. Would it not?

Moreover, such a continued fossilized existence of Earth's imperfect output with that essential element of progress gone,—a partial annihilation of the work of the Almighty,—would leave a hopeless and comparatively worthless product on His hands;—would it not?—a fossilized mass of imperfections. What sense would there be in annihilating part,—an essential part,—the only progressive part,—the only hopeful part of that product (result of endless toil, adaptation and preparation)? Why did He ever create that spirit of progress in man at all, if it was only to be thus annihilated and leave him a fossilized imperfection? Saw we a human engaged in such a process, would we not pronounce him,—and rightly pronounce him,—a fool? What good would

be accomplished thereby? If the spirit of progress was doing well,—was producing some good results,—and who will deny but that it was, why cut it off? Would that be an act of wisdom?

Who will charge the Almighty with folly—and with such folly? Is not such folly on His part, an impossibility for Him?

WHAT OUR CONCLUSION?

What conclusion then is there left for us to form? When to man's spirit a Life Beyond is granted, is it granted to it entire?—or only in mutilated form,—with the essential element of progress annihilated? Is man's spirit permitted to survive only if thus mutilated? Who will venture to charge the All-Wise One with such unmitigated folly?

If, in principle, to annihilate that essential part of man's spirit is as much the action of a fool as the total annihilation of his spirit,—and that partial annihilation is, in principle, as contrary to the wisdom of the All-Wise One, as would be total annihilation itself,—and hence be for Him an impossibility,—what is the only conclusion left us? When the Almighty does not annihilate the spirit of man, but grants to it a Life Beyond, does He grant equally to that essential part of man's nature,—the element of progress,—a Life Beyond also, as part and parcel of his nature, just as He does to the rest of his spirit?—or does He grant the Life Beyond to man's spirit

only in mutilated form?—leaving his spirit to exist throughout eternity a maimed, fossilized piece of imperfection?

Is not to ask that question, to answer it?

With an all-wise and all-powerful Ruler reigning in the universe, who will ascribe to Him such folly?

What then must our conclusion be,—that He will annihilate that spirit of progress, will cut off from man his only hope for the future, and cause his mutilated spirit to live on through eternity an unchangeable imperfection?—or that He will grant to that spirit of progress,—that essential element in man's nature,—the same continuing life as He grants to all the rest; and permit man's spirit to thus survive *entire*,—thereby giving to his spirit hope and progress in the future?

Is not to ask that question, to answer it?

And if so, must not our conclusion,—the only reasonable conclusion,—necessarily be, that in giving to man's nature a Life Beyond, He imparts it to that nature *entire*; and hence causes that spirit of progress also to survive? Why perpetuate a maimed product fossilized, when an *entire*, vital living product is to be had?

In short, if bad, why did the All-Wise One ever put the element of progress in man's spirit at all? But if good, why destroy it? Why not let it continue to exist and function as in the past?

For all reasons, then, and from every standpoint, it is submitted that the Almighty has been guilty of no such folly as to annihilate that essential element in man's spirit,—leaving it to exist a maimed product throughout eternity; but, on the contrary, that He permits that essential integral element in man's nature to survive also, thereby giving to man's spirit a forward outlook,—a hope of progress in the future,—and consequently that He permits man's spirit to survive *entire*.

PROGRESS A LAW IN THE LIFE BEYOND

And if, then, in the Life Beyond that element of progress is permitted to live on,—as it is submitted it is,—that means that in that Life Beyond *progress* continues to be a law of our spirit-life there, as well as here. Is not that so?

HOW BEST ACHIEVED?

And if progress is the law of life in the Life Beyond, which is the better way to achieve that progress,—to let Earth's mixed multitude live on together there, a heterogeneous throng of good, bad and indifferent; or to separate that mixed mass into its component parts and grade them according to their respective natures and attainments;—letting those separate classes live on separately, by them-

selves, their members matched with others of approximately like capabilities?

Is not to ask that question, to answer it?

HOW ON EARTH?

How was it on Earth?

Has Earth's experience any light to shed on that subject? What plan or system worked best there?

On Earth all lived together a mixed heterogeneous mass, except in one branch of their spirit-life,—in the training of the mind,—where a different system was pursued. In that branch, instead of leaving all grades together, they were divided according to their capabilities and attainments into separate graded classes, A, B, and C. Thus each one was put to working and competing with others of like ability and attainments. For to let all go on together would be keeping bright scholars of superior attainments back, working with dullards,—listless and dissatisfied;—and keep the dullards, unable to grasp the advances of brighter minds, despondent and hopeless.

In practice here that division of the mixed mass into graded classes was found to work best,—better than leaving all together, with each grade hindering the others;—and thus in all schools where possible, grading was adopted.

In brief, grading was found, one might say, to be a law of best spirit-progress. Compared with it,

trying to teach a mixed heterogeneous mass, was a hopeless, vain effort.

Perhaps some one may ask, If classification is best, why did not the All-Wise One adopt classification on the Earth? Why did He let them all grow up together?

In a greenhouse, where plant-life is started, the plants are not separated in the beginning. They are all started together. Later, after they have developed a little headway, then they are sorted out and separated. On Earth all start together. It is after, when they have developed a little, that grading begins.

HOW IN THE LIFE BEYOND?

When spirits pass on to the Life Beyond, they are the same spirits still as here. And being the same spirits still, why will not the same laws of spirit-life,—those found to work best here,—work well there? It is submitted that they will; and that grading that mixed multitude which leaves Earth together, into its various classes of like nature and attainment, will produce better results in that Life Beyond than to keep them all on together, a heterogeneous mixture. Is not that obviously so? Imagine in any department infants being assigned to work with seniors. Hence classification would seem to be the best method for progress there as here.

It is further submitted that a method which works best in one branch of the spirit-life,—in that of the mind,—is presumably likely to work well in other branches of the spirit-life also. Indeed, is it not a well-known fact that in character,—for growth in integrity, for instance,—it is better that a young man associate with honest men rather than with crooks?—for character is catching. And in morals, it is submitted, that for growth in purity, for instance, it is better that one associate with the pure rather than with the impure and degraded. That is obviously so,—is it not? Hence for upward growth in any branch of the spirit, it is submitted that association of like with like best conduces to progress.

And for growth in love, is it not obvious that association of the loving with the loving is more conducive to growth in love, than association with the cold, hard-hearted and selfish;—or with criminals? Which of those two environments, think you, would be more likely to produce better results in the growth of a spirit in love? Is not to ask that question to answer it? Would not associating with loving natures better conduce to growth in love than to associate with the 'hard-boiled'? Is not that so? For while character is catching, is not the bad even more catching than the good? Will not one bad apple spoil a dozen good ones? But will a dozen good apples make one bad apple good?

Hence, if association of those of like nature and

attainments in each department of spirit with others of like nature and attainment best conduces to progress, to spirit growth,—as it is submitted it does,—then does not that go to show that in the Life Beyond, Earth's heterogeneous mixed output will presumably be divided into its component classes and be graded according to their natures and attainments?—and that they will not be left to live on together throughout eternity a heterogeneous mixed mass,—with infants consorting with seniors, or the loving with crooks?

If then it seems clear that to attain the best results for each spirit in the Life Beyond, is to put that spirit into a grade and class with kindred spirits of like nature and attainments as its own (not leaving infants to consort with seniors, nor the loving with criminals) then does it not seem reasonable,—nay certain,—that the All-Wise One will, in that Life Beyond, in order to attain the best results, separate Earth's heterogeneous mass into its component grades;—with those in each grade living on together, separated from those of other grades? Does not that seem reasonable, — nay, practically certain?

What other course is there better than that,—better adapted than that,—to accomplish progress for all?

Either that mixed multitude must be divided or

else it must be kept on together. To leave them together checks the progress of all. Which of those two courses is better?—more reasonable? Which complies with the experience, practice and best results obtained on Earth? Which complies with the laws of mentality as tested out here?

What can be urged in favor of keeping them on together? It is submitted that nothing can be urged in favor of so doing.

With everything, then, from every standpoint, favoring a division into grades and nothing whatever opposing, what conclusion is there left for us to form regarding what the All-Wise One, in His inherent and infinite wisdom, does with that heterogeneous mixed mass that passes over from Earth and enters the Life Beyond? Is there any reason to believe that He does otherwise than to separate them into their component grades and classes? Would not claiming that He did otherwise with them throughout eternity be imputing to Him folly? In view of it all, then, is there any other conclusion to be formed, in reason, than that at some time in that Life Beyond, and presumably at its beginning, He separates that mixed multitude into its respective grades and classes, to facilitate progress by them all?

Is it reasonable to impute to Him any other course?

PRACTICALLY A CERTAINTY?

To what conclusion, then, do all these reasons alike tend to lead us?

With practically all reasons favoring and with none opposing, do they not all lead us to conclude that in the Life Beyond a division of Earth's medley into grades and classes, according to their various natures and attainments, is to be expected and is made? Is not that practically a certainty? Into how many grades and classes we do not know; but certainly into not less than two,—those of the loving and of the unloving.

Is not then a separation of Earth's mixed output into grades and classes, practically, a certainty? What else can be expected? What else is possible if the best results are to be attained?

WHAT MEANS GRADING IN THE LIFE BEYOND?

And what does that separation and grading mean? It means a division of spirits in the Life Beyond into communities of kindred natures and attainments;—does it not? It means that each spirit will be put in a grade and class with spirits like itself,—of its own nature and attainments;—does it not?—and hence that it will be separated from spirits of other grades and classes,—of other natures and attainments,—does it not? That is to say, it will be separated from spirits more loving and lovable than itself, as well

as from those less loving and lovable. Is not that so?

And what does that division mean?

That from all spirits graduating from the Earth-life more loving and lovable than our own, we will be separated. That life for us there will be a life separate from those more loving and lovable ones we have met and known on Earth; and be for us a life in an environment all our own. Is not that so?

HEAVEN ITSELF?

What would it mean to us to be separated from all those more loving and lovable ones whom we have met and known on Earth?

True, visiting may, perhaps, be permitted between grades and classes; but if so, then necessarily by spirits more loving visiting those less so;—for were the opposite permitted, the abodes of the more loving would be swamped and those of the less so, deserted; and the result would be a heterogeneous mass with no separation made.

But even with visiting,—with such brief and spasmodic visiting,—permitted; what is visiting, compared to living with those we love?

Compared to living with those like ourselves,—the less loving,—what would it mean to us to live with those more loving ones we have met and known on Earth?

Would that not be for us, by comparison, heaven itself?

And for the loving to live on with the loving,—separated from the unloving and unlovely,—would not that be for them heaven also?

FACING REALITIES

Must we not face realities as they are?—the facts, as we find they must be?

Why run our head against a stone wall after it has been determined that it is a stone wall?

If, on the other hand, it has been determined it is an Elysium, why throw away our chance? Why not qualify in Earth's school to enter there,—the loving class in the Life Beyond? It is within our reach. Why not take advantage of our opportunity and enter?

A word to the wise is sufficient.

HEAVEN ITSELF

We see, then, that for some there is, in that Life Beyond, Heaven itself.

Why not for us also?

*
* *

VI

IN LIGHT OF
SCIENTIFIC FACTS
HAS MATTER ALWAYS EXISTED?

Has Matter Always Existed?

VI

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC FACTS,—
HAS MATTER ALWAYS EXISTED?

If matter has always existed,—that is, throughout the infinitude of the past,—it is obvious that all transitory changes in matter,—that is, all changes in matter which could be accomplished within any period of time or years,—would, during that infinitude, have been completed;—would they not? And all matter,—all parts of matter,—would have reached their final permanent form. That is obviously so,—is it not?

But we find that not all of matter has yet reached its final permanent form. We find that parts of matter are still undergoing change; are disintegrating; are changing from one substance into another. They have not yet all reached their final permanent form.

Thus, we find that not all of radium has yet changed into lead, its final form, but only parts of it. ("Furthermore, prolonged tests seemed to indicate that . . . radium eventually turned into common lead"—Compton's Encl. p. 2959, Radium.) ("Radium . . ." is "the sixth . . . of the disintegration series that begins with the rare element uranium and ends with the common element lead", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 14th Edition, Vol. 18, p. 906c.) Other parts of it are still in process of making that change. Obviously, therefore, not all of radium has always existed. Thorium, actinium and other substances are also still undergoing similar changes. They are still giving off radio emanations and are gradually becoming other substances. There are quite a number of these radio-active substances (of which "Sir J. J. Thomson, another great English scientist, said in 1908: 'Researches have led to the discovery of so many new radio-active substances that any attempt at christening them seems to have been abandoned, and they are denoted, like policemen, by the letters of the alphabet.'") (Compton's Encl. p. 2961, Radium.)

Those substances are all giving off emanations, are all disintegrating, are all changing. None of them has yet reached its final permanent form. When they do, radium will have disappeared. All of radium will have become lead. And similarly, all those radio-active substances will have ceased to

exist. They will all have become changed into other substances.

Radium disintegrates at a regular rate of one-half in 1760 years ("at its invariable slow rate of 1760 years for half disintegration", Compton's Encl. p. 2959).

The change that radium is undergoing in that disintegration is measured by its loss in weight. The atomic weight of radium (the weight of one atom of radium) is 226. The atomic weight of lead, into which it changes, is 207.2 (Compton's Encl. p. 4042). The difference in weight which an atom of radium loses in becoming lead is therefore 18.8, or about one-twelfth of its original weight. Thorium's atomic weight is 232.15. Uranium's is 238.2. (*Ibid.*)

Had radium always existed,—had it existed during the entire infinitude of the past, exceeding all periods measured by time,—there would have been time enough and to spare for all parts of radium to have finished those changes; for all radium's disintegrations to have been completed; and for all of radium to have reached its final permanent form of lead. The fact that all of radium has not yet reached its final permanent form shows that radium has not always existed;—has not existed during all the infinitude of the past;—but only during part of that infinitude; and hence shows that radium must have

come into existence at some time during that infinitude.

What is true of radium is equally true of thorium, of actinium, and of all the many other radio-active substances. None of them has yet reached its final permanent form. All of them are still changing. None of them has existed for an infinity. None of them, therefore, has always existed. All of them, therefore, must have come into existence at some time or times during that infinitude of the past.

MERELY A SURMISE

Hence, obviously, all of matter has not always existed. It is obvious that part of matter,—parts of matter,—many parts of matter,—have not always existed. And what is true of a part,—or parts,—of many parts,—is presumably true of the whole,—especially where there is no evidence to the contrary. And there is not a particle of evidence to show that any part of matter has always existed,—much less the whole of it.

The claim that matter has always existed is therefore merely a surmise,—a theory without evidence to support it.

WHAT ANSWER, THEN?

What answer, then, shall we make to the question, *Has matter always existed?* Can we say that it has? We cannot.

What can we say other than that parts of matter,—many parts of matter,—have not always existed; that what is true of parts,—of many parts,—is presumably and is usually true of the whole; and as we find that all of matter, that very many parts of matter, have not always existed, the only conclusion we can reach, in reason, is that matter has not always existed.

What other conclusion is there for us to arrive at?—especially in view of the fact that there is not a particle of evidence to show that *any* part of matter has always existed?

All we can say is, that all the facts and all the evidence in our possession go to show that matter has not always existed; and any theory that matter has always existed is therefore purely a naked theory, unproven, and without foundation of evidence to support it.

A CREATOR

The fact that radium has not always existed, but came into existence at some time during the infinitude of the past, shows, incidentally, that radium was created,—does it not? For radium could not create itself,—could it? Before radium existed it was nothing; and nothing could not create something,—could it? Hence radium could not create itself; and hence, since it came into existence at some time during the infinitude of the past, ra-

dium must have been created,—must it not? Is not that obviously so?

And the fact that radium was created shows, incidentally, that there was a Creator in the universe who created it. For it could not be created without a Creator to create it,—could it?

And the fact that there was a Creator of radium shows, also incidentally, that there was in the universe a Ruler over the matter He had created,—does it not? Is not that so?

And what is true of radium is equally true of thorium, of actinium, and of all the rest of the other radio-active substances,—the number of which is constantly increasing. (“The list of such substances is constantly growing”, Compton’s Encl. p. 2961.) They are all giving off radio matter, radio-emana-tions; are all changing;—devoluting,—into lighter substances. None of them has yet entirely reached its final form. None of them therefore has always existed. All of them therefore came into existence at some time during the infinitude of the past. Each of them therefore has been created; and each shows the existence of a Creator in the universe, and a Ruler over the matter He created. Is not that so?

MATTER CREATED

Moreover, it appears from the foregoing,—incidentally also, quite incidentally,—that part matter,

—parts of matter,—many parts of matter,—have been created. As what is true of part,—of parts,—of many parts,—is presumably true of the whole, the presumption arises,—the strong presumption arises,—that matter, all of matter, has been created,—especially in view of the fact that there is not a particle of evidence to the contrary, to show that any part of matter has always existed.

However that may all be,—whether any part of matter has always existed or not,—we see that radium and its many cognate substances, abundantly show that *all* of matter has not always existed; and hence that parts of matter,—many parts of matter,—have been created; which in turn shows the existence of a Creator, and hence of a Ruler over matter,—God of the universe. That is surely so,—is it not?

Once again therefore,—and quite incidentally,—we find ourselves driven to the same conclusion so often arrived at before (see, “Is There, Or Is There Not, a God?”), that there exists in the universe, a Creator, Ruler of matter, God over it all.

What other conclusion is there?

Is there any escape from that conclusion?

All of which is submitted for your consideration, conclusion and verdict.

*

*

*

VII

IN LIGHT OF

FACTS

DOES THE BIBLE PROVE ITSELF?



A LAYMAN'S LETTER.

Does the Bible,
In Its Essential Message,
Prove Itself?

VII

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,
WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS
IN LIGHT OF FACTS,—
DOES THE BIBLE, IN ITS ESSENTIAL MESSAGE,
PROVE ITSELF?

If you or I dug up, in China, an ancient document, dated 2,000 years ago, entitled, “Recipe for Making Gunpowder”, which, after sketching the founding of the empire and some past and contemporaneous events, disclosed what it termed the most wonderful discovery of all time, which would place in the hands of its happy possessor a mighty power, and closed:— “Mix saltpeter, charcoal and sulphur together” (in proportions given) “and they will produce gunpowder”; what would you say would be the best way to test the truth of that recipe? Would it be to sit down and discuss its authorship, its age, or to criticize its early historical accounts? Or would it be to mix those ingredients together in proportions named, and touch a match to the product?

If the mixture exploded and we found it was indeed gunpowder, would not that be the best possible proof of the truth of that recipe? Would not the recipe itself thereby prove its own truth,—by producing what it said it would produce?

In other words, if a document says that certain results will follow a given course of action, and we want to test the truth of that document; if we follow out the course of action prescribed and the promised results follow; why does not the accomplishment of the results promised prove the truth of that document?—and in the most satisfactory way possible,—by producing what it promised? Is not this testing a document by actual trial of what it proposes, better than all argument about it? Is not the actual production of the results promised the best possible proof of the truth of the document? By producing the promised results, does not the document thereby *prove itself*?

What better proof could we have of its truth than that?

HOW WITH THE BIBLE?

How is it with the Bible?

After tracing down the history of a people from their earliest beginnings, the Bible finally tells of Christ, His teachings; and says if men will accept and follow Him, that certain results will follow in their lives.

TESTING ITS TRUTH

What is the best way to test the truth of those statements?

Is it to argue about the historical accounts given, their authorship; whether two men or one wrote certain parts of it; or even as to who wrote down His teachings?

What useful purpose do such lines of investigation or criticism serve?

Is it not better to apply to those teachings the same test as that suggested for testing the recipe for gunpowder, to do what they say; and if, when practiced, the promised results follow, why is not that the most satisfactory of all possible proofs of its truth?

And if this,—the best, it is submitted, of all possible tests,—is applied to Christ's teachings, what do we find follows?

First of all, what did He say would follow? That those who in their hearts accept and follow Him, will bear "fruit" (John 15:2, 5, 8, R.V.) of joy and unselfish love (verses 11, 12, 13, R. V.) and will gradually grow into His likeness,—of unselfish love and service to others.

THE TESTS

Have His way and teachings been thus tested by anyone's putting them into practice? They have, and by many. If we watch, we can see those tests going on daily about us.

Take, for instance, such a man as the late Jerry McAuley of New York City: once a river thief, and some say even worse; who in a humble Mission was led to accept Christ and live for Him. Turning from his past life of crime to humbly following his newly found and chosen Master, his work for Him established a Mission in 32d Street in New York City, bearing his name, known throughout the City and the land; where hundreds,—nay, thousands,—of down-and-outs have like him been led to choose a better way in life and to follow the Master. At his funeral, the late Rev. John Hall began his address by saying, “Here lies the body of one of the most useful men in New York City.”

Take the case of the late Dwight L. Moody, who, at the age of 18 was, through his Sunday School teacher, led to accept the Saviour and follow Him:—a youth with not even a grammar school education; who later, surrendering business and a growing income of about \$5,000 a year, gave himself up wholeheartedly and without a dollar of assured salary, to His service; and became the world-wide known Evangelist, an instrument in leading thousands and tens of thousands to his Master; founder of the Northfield Schools and the Chicago Bible Institute, from which today about 1,000 students graduate annually and go forth to lives of Christian service;—and who also founded the Northfield Conferences, which have been followed at a number of other centers throughout the land.

These are but types,—a couple of striking instances,—and similar humbler instances can be found in all walks of life,—if we open our eyes to take notice of them.

WHAT RESULTS?

Those men accepted His offer and followed Him, as He asked. Were not the changes He said would follow, wrought in their lives? From sin and preying upon the public was not the promised change of bearing “fruit” wrought in the life of Jerry McAuley? And in the life of D. L. Moody, was not fruit borne in his changed life and self-sacrificing ministry, by means of which thousands of other lives were likewise changed?

In those lives of Jerry McAuley and of D. L. Moody, do we not see instances of men who put Christ’s teachings to the test, and forsaking their own ways, followed Him and His teachings? And did not the promised results follow in their lives?

If we look around us, are not similar results to be seen in the changed lives of some about us in every walk of life who have accepted and followed Him, and whose lives have been changed as promised?

Do we not also see the promised results showing themselves in the changing lives of some about us who have accepted Him in their hearts and are following Him in their lives?—as also in the lives of ministers, missionaries, evangelists, and of humble

Sunday School teachers (through a devoted one of whom it was that D. L. Moody himself was led to accept and follow Him) ?

PROOFS

If we look about us with eyes open, may we not discern in our own neighborhood one or more such, who have given their hearts to the Master (and are following Him), in whom we can also see those changes wrought or being wrought? I think we may. He has not left Himself without a witness.

Are not those and other changed lives,—changed by following and *after* having followed Him and His teachings,—the very best possible proofs of the truth of those teachings,—the essential message of the bible?

What better proofs could we have of its truth? Put to the test,—tested by actual trial, as He Himself suggested,—its teachings produce in so many instances the results promised.

CHRIST INVITED TRIAL TEST

Christ Himself said, "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man *willeth* to do his will, he shall *know* of the teaching, whether it is *of God*, or whether I speak from myself." (John 7:16, 17, R. V.)

Christ thus *invited actual trial as the test by*

which to prove the truth of His teachings. The above are the actual *trial-proofs*,—the irrefragable proofs,—of the truth of His teachings.

Do not His teachings thereby prove themselves?

DOES THE BIBLE PROVE ITSELF?

With such trials, such tests, and such proofs of fulfilment in our possession, why need we argue whether one man or two wrote down the various accounts that bring down to us those gems of vital truth?

Do not those truths when loyally followed, prove themselves?

If so,—and it is submitted that they do,—what need have we of further proofs of the truth of the bible's essential message, save as, from time to time, we continue to note their fresh fulfilment in the changed or changing lives of those about us?

And if this is so,—as it is submitted in all candor that it is,—then why does not the bible, in its essential, its vital message,—like the recipe for making gunpowder,—upon being put to the test of actual trial, thereby *prove itself*,—*prove its own truth*?

Just as the recipe for gunpowder proved its truth, by making the product it claimed to make; why does not the bible in like manner prove its truth, by causing in the lives of men, women, and even of children, those changes it promised would follow

in the lives of those who accepted and followed His teachings?

Can those changed lives about us, or their proofs of the truth of the bible, be successfully denied? It is submitted they cannot be.

And if that is true,—as it is submitted it is,—then why does not the bible, in its essential message of Christ's salvation, indeed *prove itself*?

*

*

*

A LAYMAN'S LETTER

Letter from a Layman to 'The Man in the Street'.

MY DEAR SIR:—

May I draw to your attention the manuscript herewith entitled, "Does the Bible, In Its Essential Message, Prove Itself?"

If so, permit me to say you know of the many controversies regarding the bible.

CRITICISMS

You remember they started criticism years ago with the claim that because of certain differences in style in the book of Isaiah there were, therefore, two authors of that book, one for the first and an-

other for the latter part of it;—although in a prophet who prophesied for *over 60 years*, some change in style was to be expected,—was it not? Not only so, but, it is submitted, there is less difference in style in the book of Isaiah than there is difference in the styles of the late D. L. Moody's writings,—between the addresses he delivered at the beginning and those at the end of his public career, although those covered less than 60 years.

You are also aware that the same claim of a two-fold authorship was later advanced to others of the leading books of the old testament, and later even to some of those of the new.

And that was followed by claims that the alleged two authors of books of the old testament, instead of following one another, had overlapped, or perhaps were contemporaneous; and that their accounts had since been collated and edited or fitted into each other by some subsequent writer;—with, of course, all the inherent implied possibilities of a humanly edited or constructed version.

ATTACKS

Before and since that came also attacks on the accounts of the so-called creation,—but really on accounts of the Earth's preparation for habitation by man;—for, according to the bible, the Earth itself has been created *indefinite aeons* before that.

THE CREATION

Thus, Genesis reads:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was waste and void." For how long?—Myriads of years, before it had cooled down sufficiently from its molten state to even allow water to remain on its hot surface. ("The Earth must at one time have been a mass of molten rock." Compton's Encl. p. 1060, Earth.) And "darkness was upon the face of the deep". For how long? Further myriads of years, until the seething water had cooled down sufficiently to permit life to exist in it. And "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."—For how long?—For how many ages?—No one knows. (Genesis 1:1, 2, R. V.)

JONAH

Then came the controversies regarding Jonah. Scientists asserted no whale had a throat big enough to swallow a man,—even though the book of Jonah does not say that a whale swallowed him, but, "Jehovah prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah" (Jonah 1:17, R. V.), which the Almighty confessedly could just as easily prepare as to create monsters like the diplodocus, 87 feet long, which He has done (Compton's Encl. p. 134, Animals).

DOUBTS AND DENIALS

Then a whole crop of doubts and denials broke out;—denial of the Virgin birth; denial of all miracles (which would seem of necessity to include the greatest of all physical miracles, that of the resurrection); denial of the deity of Christ,—in brief, denials of the foundations of the Gospels.

•

WANTING A NEW BIBLE

Then came a minister—who, the *Times* reported, even denied “the existence of a conscious personal God”, but who still asserted, “I am not godless—Nature is my divinity.” (*New York Times*, Feb. 21, 1924.) (Apparently he seemed to be a pantheist.)

Then came a leading Modernist demanding a new bible, with Lincoln as its spiritual leader. (*New York Times*, Feb. 28, 1924.)

FUNDAMENTALISTS

Is it any wonder, in this chaos, that many of the average laymen,—who too often, instead of thinking things out for themselves and deciding what is rock and what is sinking sand, believe what others tell them,—taking the opinion of this minister, or of that divine,—and then if those others stumble or go off at a tangent which they feel they are unable to follow,—are in danger of losing their faith altogether?

As belief in the bible from cover to cover has, in time past, abundantly availed to save men (as evidence of which, witness their changed lives, from selfishness to unselfish devotion to the welfare of others), is it any wonder that when people think the so-called higher critics, or Modernists, are threatening to take away from them all the foundations of religion,—the only saving religion in the world,—men should have sprung up to save from impending wreck that ship which was carrying them safely across life's ocean,—which had carried thousands, nay millions, of others across that ocean in safety? Is it any wonder that the destructive criticisms of the higher critics—without substituting anything constructive instead—should have brought into being the Fundamentalists, who, rather than lose all, preferred to preserve what in the past had proved amply sufficient for salvation?

Is it any wonder that the Fundamentalists, to prevent a lapse into those quicksands which, little by little, had been sapping their bible away from them, should have gone, on the other hand, to the other extreme; and rather than lose their bible, or any essential part of it, have preferred to believe it literally from cover to cover, as their fathers had done before them?

CHRIST'S TEACHING SPIRITUAL

Christ Himself said to His disciples, "the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life"

(John 6:63, R. V.); and as Paul said, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." (2 Corinthians 3:6, R. V.)

Christ, then, taught His teachings are spiritual, and are to be spiritually interpreted. But for that reason He did not discard the literal words which embody that spiritual teaching. He did not discard Jonah, nor the great fish, which either His disciples or His disciples' reporter called a "whale". (Matthew 12:40, R. V.)

FROM LITERAL, EXTRACT SPIRITUAL

To take everything only literally would, of course, be wide of the mark. But may one not take all that is literally given and from it extract its spiritual meaning?

This of course gives to each one endless latitude of personal interpretation. But to that is there any objection—since it invites and requires study of the bible and thought, and hence leads to individual decisions?

Consequently some of the Fundamentalists may believe the words literally and others of them may take them very spiritually. This, of course, permits the Modernists to cite only the literalists and through them to condemn all Fundamentalists and hold them up to ridicule.

To take all literally is therefore contrary to Christ's own teaching of the interpretation of His

words; and to do so serves to give to the Modernists great handles for attack.

INDIVIDUAL INTERPRETATION

It looks as if all this were going to compel more individual study of the bible, and decisions regarding its truth, by each one for himself. So it seems that ultimately it may work out great good.

Certainly there has never been such a widespread interest regarding the bible before. A friend who went the other night to an exhibition of bible paintings in New York City, said the crowd was so great the police had to handle it, and large numbers were turned away.

INDIVIDUAL FAITH AMID CHAOS

But meantime, what about the faith of laymen and laywomen who,—never having taken time to investigate and *settle the foundations for themselves*,—have taken what someone else said to them and are thus resting on the opinions of others? When those others sway, change, doubt, discard, and deny, what is this great mass of church-going, but unthinking people going to do in the present apparent (though not real) chaos of the foundations of religion?

“AFRAID WOULD LOSE HIS RELIGION”

Thus, a friend of our minister recently wrote asking him to call, saying he was very much disturbed

over some of the recent controversies, and between them he feared he was going to lose his religion. He said if he had to believe that Christ with His flesh and blood body went down to hell, and with His flesh and blood body went up to heaven, and was up there now sitting at God's right hand in His flesh and blood body,—if he had to believe all that to keep his religion,—he was afraid he would lose his religion. He said the Fundamentalists told him he would lose his religion if he did not believe it; and the Modernists said he would lose it if he did.

TO AVOID SCYLLA AND CARYBDIS

Our minister said it was an easy matter to set him straight. He said the Fundamentalists seem to believe that God had finished His work when Christ left the earth and to believe in a God of the past.

He said that Christ in parting from His disciples had told them, "I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth:" (John 16:12, 13, R. V.) ;—that is, when Christ left them, He had not said the last word.

He said to successfully avoid the Scylla of the Fundamentalists and the Carybdis of the Modernists, two things were necessary. The first was belief in God as a present, living God. And the second, was reverence. That belief in God as a present

living God would carry one past the dangers of the Fundamentalists; and that reverence for God,—which the Modernists seemed so largely to lack, some of them seeming willing, at times, even to throw the bible into the discard,—would carry one safely past the risks of the Modernists. He said no one was entitled to expound the bible unless he had a reverence for God,—the Author of the bible (not thereby meaning the verbal inspiration of it, however, but that the men who wrote it had been personally inspired and afterwards they had written it in their own words).

Now, not every one will have such a friend at his side as had this man who wrote to our minister.

THINK FOR THEMSELVES

Until laymen begin to think for themselves,—to test and settle for themselves the foundations of religion, such as the existence of God, etc.,—just so long as they let someone else do their thinking for them, just so long they are liable to be, and will be, upset by such controversies. And many, very many, are liable now to be upset by them, just as was that man.

They must for themselves determine the eternal verities. When each settles the foundations for himself he will no longer be disturbed by someone else thinking or believing differently.

FOUNDATIONS UPSET?

At present even the very foundations seem to be in danger of being upset, and matters seem to be getting worse day by day.

Seeing the books of the bible attacked,—and by so many of its supposed defenders,—and one of the very foundations thus apparently sinking under their feet, it cannot be otherwise than that many,—very many,—will indeed lose their faith,—let us, however, hope not forever.

ROCK,—GIBRALTAR

And yet not all is sinking sand. There is rock. There is adamant. There is safety. There is Gibraltar. There is not only hope, but even certainty for all.

With a view of laying before you proof that the bible is indeed not all sinking sand,—that it still contains rock unshaken and unshakable,—that it is still amply strong today to save all who believe and follow its teachings; permit me to hand you herewith a copy of 'The Man in the Street', What is He to Believe These Days in Light of Facts? Does the Bible, in Its Essential Message, Prove Itself?

HOW RECEIVED

To give an idea of how this article may strike and be received by laymen, permit me to add that it was first sent to but four persons,—three of them ladies (of high social standing in New York City), and

the fourth a retired millionaire lawyer of Wall Street.

The first of the ladies in returning the manuscript said, "Of course, it is all true."

The second wrote that she "was very glad to see it" and "read it with great interest. Thank you for sending it to me."

The third wrote, "I read your enclosure with great interest, and indeed enjoyed the reading of it very much. To my mind 'to live the life' seems of so much more importance than the fact of the Virgin Birth, etc.—and I can't see why one should put so much importance on those minor details. They don't really matter,—and as to trying a clergyman for heresy who expresses his views on the subject, it really seems a work of the Middle Ages. . . . I want to thank you for your kind thought" (in sending it).

The fourth, the retired lawyer, wrote,—“I return the typewritten statement you sent me which I have read with very great interest.

“You are right in saying that by following the directions in the Bible, we become better men and women.”

SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Trusting you may find the enclosed manuscript of interest, as well as possibly helpful, permit me to submit it for your consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

A LAYMAN

VIII

IN LIGHT OF

FACTS

WHAT OF HOPE FOR WRECKED LIVES?

What of Hope
for
Wrecked Lives?

VIII

‘THE MAN IN THE STREET’,

WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS

IN LIGHT OF FACTS,—

WHAT OF HOPE FOR WRECKED LIVES?

For lives wrecked in life’s struggle, what hope, in light of facts, is there left them?

Left to themselves, there is none. Enamored and ensnared by life’s temptations, with wills overcome by continually yielding to them, of themselves, they can do nothing. They are lost,—hopelessly lost.

Entering life with moral sense and the monitor within; and with the teaching and training of parents to guide them (except as prevented by disobedience); what hope can ‘The Man in the Street’ indulge for those already living wrecks?

Humanly speaking, none. In themselves, experience and the facts show that, practically, there is none. Enchained by besetting sins into which they have fallen,—and to which they have yielded them-

selves and become enslaved, those human wrecks, in themselves, are lost to hope;—sinking ever deeper and deeper into the mire.

Is there no way of escape?

In and of themselves there is none.

Are they then beyond hope?

In and of themselves, they are. Powerless to save themselves from their enthralling sins in whose ever strengthening meshes they are held as in a vice, all hope in and of themselves has long ceased. They are wrecks,—hopeless wrecks,—wholly within the power of their overmastering adversary. This we know to be so,—do we not? We see them daily sinking about us, all hope gone,—suicides and others. That is so, is it not?

Is their fate then sealed?

Yes, in the light of facts, in and of themselves, their fate is sealed. Only through a Power mightier than themselves;—mightier than their temptations;—mightier than their sins;—mightier than their adversary;—only through help from above is there way of escape.

What is that way? And is there way of escape for young lives just starting in life from entering that downward course; and for those who have taken but a few steps in it?

THAT WAY

When about 13 or 14 years old, although a church member, the Way of return was not clear to me. I

well remember a school mate of mine, a little older than myself, saying he thought it very simple (as I now see it to be) ; but he did not offer to explain it. I was sorry he did not, but did not ask him to do so.

Thank God, one does not have to understand all about the Way of return, all about the "How" and the "Why", in order to be saved from destruction. It is enough if we understand the steps we are asked to take and take them. God, to whom we fly for refuge and help, does the rest, whether we understand His way and His reasons or not;—if we but take the steps asked of us. The rest is His part. We need not be concerned about that. He will do it, and do it well. All we need see to is, to make sure we do our part and take the steps He asks of us.

Some of the best Christians in the world are the colored people living, as many of them do, in an atmosphere of good nature, kindliness, smiles and love. If you should ask some of them to explain the "How" or the "Why" of the Way, they likely would be unable to do so. Nevertheless they are saved,—are often much better saved than some of those who may be able, perhaps, to explain the "How" or the "Why"; but who are not doing the really essential thing,—following the Master,—living the life. Although not understanding the "How", nor able to explain the "Why", they are fulfilling the conditions asked,—are following His teachings and example,

are living as He taught,—and He is doing all the rest for them.

THE WAY OF RETURN

Before considering the Way of Return, let us first consider the condition of one of those wrecked lives,—enchained by overmastering sin. He is a son, a disobedient, an erring, or it may be a prodigal son,—but nevertheless a son,—of his loving heavenly Father, God. How can he be restored to his Father, to living in the sunshine of His smile? So long as he continues in willful disobedience, that, evidently, is impossible;—is it not? What is the Way back to his Father? That is the question.

With an earthly father, how is it? What is the way for a disobedient son to be restored and again live with his father? You say by turning to his father, confessing manfully his wrong-doing; asking for forgiveness; receiving it, and then starting out to live in obedience,—in harmony with his father. You are right. That is the Way, the only Way, and all of the way back to an earthly father's smile. And that is also the way back to our heavenly Father's smile.

Of that fact,—of that being the way back to our heavenly Father's smile,—the picture drawn by the Saviour of the prodigal son is an apt and complete illustration. From his willful disobedience the prodigal turned back to his father, confessed his sins, pre-

pared to ask for a place,—even a servant's place,—in his father's household. His father forgave him freely, welcomed him back, and restored him to complete sonship. The son was saved from his wrecked life of disobedience to live again in his father's smile.

THE FASCINATING STORY

Let us read that fascinating story.

"And he" (Jesus) "said, A certain man had two sons: and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of thy substance that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living. And not many days after, the younger son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country; and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country; and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But

while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring the fatted calf, and kill it, and let us eat, and make merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." (Luke 15:11-24, R. V.)

From that illuminating story we see the loving heavenly Father, of whom the parable is a picture, was at all times ready and willing to forgive his erring son and receive him back, and that the son's being forgiven and received back all depended upon the son's turning back to his father. We also see the son's turning back to his father depended upon the son's feeling sure his father would receive him if he did turn back. Had he believed his father would not receive him, he would not have turned back. His turning back, therefore, depended upon his *trust in* his father,—that his father would receive him if he returned. In the last analysis, then, it was *his trust in his father* that led to the son's turning back and led to his being saved.

Trusting in his father, the prodigal took that essential step, turned back, confessed his sins and asked to be received back. "Father, I have sinned

against heaven and in thy sight. I am no more worthy to be called thy son." And so quick was his father,—his heavenly Father, here portrayed,—to forgive and receive him back, that while he was yet "afar off" his Father "saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." He never let his son finish the rest of his sentence, "make me as one of thy hired servants"; but interrupting, said to his servants, "Bring forth *quickly* the best robe and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet"; and he then ordered a feast to give vent to the overflowing joy that filled His Father-heart.

Who would not like to be the son of such a Father?

Well, if you would like to be, and *will* to be, you *can* be.

THE PICTURE

That is the picture, the enlightening picture, the complete picture, drawn by the Saviour Himself, of how a disobedient son can return to his heavenly Father. It is the Saviour's explanation of the "Way" back to the Father; and of how a sinning son who turns back to Him, finds his heavenly Father receives him. That is the "Way",—the "Way" back,—to turn to our Father, confess to Him our sins and ask His forgiveness. In love and joy the heavenly Father forgives and welcomes back His returning son, and restores him to complete sonship. That

wipes out his past transgressions and starts him living in the "Way" of return.

No doubt there may be, there will be, some stumbling, some failures, or fallings short, some sins again in the future. No one is perfect. But there is ever open to the soul that does not willfully continue in disobedience, the same "Way" to forgiveness for those later sins as for the earlier ones.

CHRIST'S WORDS

What are Christ's words on this subject,—on the Way back to the Father?

His parable of the prodigal clearly points out the Way;—turning to his Father, confessing his sins, asking for forgiveness, receiving it, and starting out to live with his Father, in his Father's way. The picture is complete.

Jesus at all times emphasized to His disciples the indispensable need of having faith (trust) in their heavenly Father;—in His love and willingness to forgive. When He knew that Simon (renamed by Him "Peter" a "rock") was going to turn traitor and deny Him; Jesus prayed, not that Simon should not turn traitor (which would have saved Simon from that one offense only) but that "thy faith" (Simon's trust in God's and in Jesus' forgiving love, and that He would fulfill His promises,—see Mat-

thew 18:31, R. V.) "fail not" (Luke 22:32, R. V.);—which would provide a way of escape for Simon, not from that offense alone, but from all offenses; and would, moreover, enable Simon (as Jesus also prayed), when he had "*turned again*", to "*establish*" his "brethren" (Luke 22:32, R. V.),—thereby enabling Peter to become an example and a help to them (and to others) of how to return if they fell.

In a word, Jesus prayed, after Peter had denied his Master, that Peter's *trust* in that Master's love and willingness to forgive should not fail him. And Peter's trust in his Lord's boundless forgiveness did not fail. Trusting in His measureless love and that He would fulfill His promises, Peter turned back to Him; besought His forgiveness (in bitterness of soul and with tears); was forgiven, and became that rock upon which Christ had said He would found His church;—declaring "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." (Matthew 16:18, R. V.)

To all others also, Jesus invariably emphasized the indispensable need of that pivotal point,—of having faith (trust) in His and in God's love and willingness to forgive. Thus He said to the woman in the Pharisee's house (of whom He had previously said, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven;"—Luke 7:47, R.V.) that, "Thy *faith* hath saved thee;" (Luke 7:50, R. V.),—implying that had she *lacked* faith (trust), she would not have been saved.

So too, to the woman who touched the border of His garment in the crowd, and immediately her issue of blood was stanchèd, He said, "Daughter, thy *faith* hath made thee whole" (Luke 8:48, R. V.),—implying that *but for* her faith (her trust) she would *not* have been healed.

Again, when on His way with Jairus to heal his daughter and a messenger arrived saying, "Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Teacher." Jesus said to Jairus, "Fear not: *only believe*" (only *trust*) "and she shall be made whole." (Luke 8:49, 50, R. V.)

Trust on our part in Him or in God seems therefore, in some way, to be our indispensable contribution toward His performing those mighty works. Thus, He "did not many mighty works there" (at Nazareth) "because of their unbelief." (Matthew 13:58, R. V.)

That trust, or faith, consists in our trusting in His and God's love and willingness to forgive if we turn to Him and ask, and that He can and will perform to us His promises. The enormity of our sins may stagger us, may cause us to hesitate or doubt. In that case we can pray Him to give us *increased trust* in His forgiving love, implied in His words, "him that cometh unto me I will in *no* wise cast out" (John 6:37, R. V.). We can also do what that poor father did who brought his demon-possessed son to Jesus to be cured, but whose faith was weak, as expressed in his words, "*if thou*

canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us." To whom Jesus replied, "*If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.*" Whereupon the agonized father cried out to Him to *increase* his faith, "I believe; *help thou* mine unbelief" (Mark 9:22-24, R. V.) Jesus heard his prayer; increased his faith; and healed his son. If our faith (our trust) is weak, we can ask Jesus to increase it, and He will.

CHRIST'S OTHER WORDS

Jesus also said:

"Whosoever believeth on" (trusteth on) "him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3:16, R. V.)

"My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I *give unto them eternal life*; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand." (John 10:27, 28, R. V.)

WHAT DOES HE ASK US TO DO?

To be forgiven and have life eternal, what does Jesus ask us to do?

To have faith (trust) in His and God's love and willingness to forgive; to confess to Him (or God) our sins and ask Him to forgive them; to accept Him (or God) as our Saviour (that is, to be our personal Saviour,—to save us personally); and with His help to start out to follow Jesus.

ALL THAT IS NECESSARY

All that is necessary is, in our heart to pray:

"Oh Jesus, I do trust in Thee and in Thy forgiving love. I confess to Thee my many sins and pray Thee to forgive them. I accept Thee as my Saviour. Help me to follow Thee. Amen."

After praying thus, do you believe Jesus heard that prayer?

What answer does He make to it?

"Him that cometh unto me, I will in *no* wise cast out" (above).

What then is His answer to your prayer? Does He forgive your sins?

And accept you as God's child?

Whose then are you now?

Yes, God's and Jesus'.

And now whom do you intend to live for? Yes, for God and Jesus.

A WAY OF ESCAPE

So with help from above there is a Way of escape for wrecked lives. (For instances, see No. VII, "In Its Essential Message, Does the Bible *Prove Itself?*")

There is no other.

"Neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." (Acts 4:12, R. V.)

And let us not forget, Jesus said:

"My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." (Matthew 11:30, R. V.)

THE FIRST STEP

What is the first step in the "Way" that Jesus asks every one to take?

To confess Him before men.

"Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven." (Matthew 10:32, R. V.)

Go to some minister, evangelist, Christian worker or Sunday school teacher and tell him you have accepted Christ as your Saviour.

Then start out to do something for Him—to follow Him by doing some little act of kindness or helpfulness *for Him*.

Above all, whatever comes, *never deny Him*,—never by word or deed deny that you are *His*.

NEXT STEPS

What are the next steps in "The Way",—in the new "Way" of living?

On awaking in the morning, pray to God Jesus' prayer:

"Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth. Give us this day our daily

bread. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." (Matthew 6:9-13, R. V.)

Add to it anything else you may wish to say to Him.

Thank Him for anything you may wish to thank Him for.

At night before you sleep, do the same.

Pray to Him any time during the day you wish to; or when you need Him for help to resist temptation, or for any other purpose.

If you haven't a bible or new testament, buy one (Revised Version). Read something in it every day, beginning with Luke, then John, Matthew, Mark, Acts, James; 1st and 2nd Peter; 1st, 2nd and 3rd John; Jude and Revelation. Then you can begin the old testament (containing interesting and instructive accounts of God's personal dealings with individual men,—culminating in David's paeon of assurance of supply,—temporal as well as spiritual,—"Jehovah is my shepherd; I shall not want."—Psalms 23:1, R. V.), beginning with Genesis, Exodus, etc. (reading something in the Old and something in the New).

Choose whatever church you would like to belong to, and join it.

Try to follow Jesus in daily life, doing at least

some one act of kindness for Him every day. Try *for Him* to live in love and helpfulness to others.

Engage in some line of Christian service *for Him*. Join a Bible class. Teach, perhaps, a class in Sunday School or Mission.

Try to win some one else to join you in accepting and following Him.

TO SUCCEED, WHAT IS NEEDED?

To succeed, one thing is needed.

What is it?

"Do it now."

THE FINAL INVITATION

"The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that *will*, let him take the water of life freely." (Revelation 22:17, R. V.)

Would you like to be a son of that Father?

If you would, you can be. God is that Father, and is watching and waiting for you.

What say you?

Then tell Him so.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Jesus said:

“The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls: and having found one pearl of great price, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it.” (Matthew 13:45, 46, R. V.)

BELIEF AND TESTIMONY.

Belief
and
Testimony

IX

'THE MAN IN THE STREET',

WHAT IS HE TO BELIEVE THESE DAYS?



BELIEF AND TESTIMONY OF ONE

I. I believe that Jesus of Nazareth lived in Galilee and Judea about 1900 years ago (about A.D. 1-A.D. 30).

History so records.

Josephus, the Jewish historian who lived in Judea (A.D. 37 to about A.D. 95) has recorded:

"1. But now Pilate, the procurator of Judea, removed the army from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, to take their winter quarters there, in order to abolish the Jewish laws." . . (Josephus, Vol. III, National Library Edition, Book XVIII, Chap. III, p. 92.)

"3. Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he

was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles." (*Ibid.*, p. 94.)

II. I believe that the Gospels of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, are true.

(If tested evidence of their truth is desired,—tested by the rules of evidence required in law courts,—consult "Testimony of the Evangelists" by Greenleaf, in which their testimony is subjected to the rules of evidence governing courts of law,—applied by Greenleaf himself, author of "Greenleaf on Evidence",—the recognized authority on the law and rules of evidence in all American and English law courts the world over.)

(Under that strict investigation and those tests, the testimony of the Evangelists was found to be admissible in the law courts of today.)

If we consider it for a moment, we see their testimony bears in itself marks of truth. What did they receive for giving that testimony? Persecution, stripes, imprisonment and death. It was in the face of suffering, of punishment and of death itself that they bore witness to those things. Had that testimony not been true, it never would have been given. There was no inducement for them to give it. On the contrary. And they sealed their testimony with their blood.

If ever testimony was true, it was theirs.

Moreover, His disciples were *eye-witnesses*.
And there were twelve of them.

III. I believe their accounts of the life, teaching, deeds, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth are true.

The disciples believed they were,—they were convinced they were. They were willing to lay down their lives in support of their truth. Some of them did lay them down in support of it.

Even the Pharisees, His bitter opponents, were convinced of the truth of His deeds,—His “signs” (His miracles),—that they had been performed.

One of the Pharisees, Nicodemus, so admitted to Jesus, “We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs” (these miracles) “*that thou doest*, except God be with him.” (John 3:2, R. V.)

Many of the Pharisees had doubtless witnessed a number of those miracles performed,—had been eye-witnesses of them. They had not been performed in a corner. They could not deny they had been performed. Nor did they deny them. On the contrary,—they affirmed them.

IV. I believe, as did Nicodemus (one of those Pharisees, and a ruler of the Jews), that Jesus of

Nazareth was "a teacher come from God",—for, as Nicodemus admitted, "We" (note the plural—"We", that is, we, the Pharisees) "*know* that thou art a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs" (these miracles) "that thou doest, *except God be with him.*" (John 3:2, R. V.)

That argument and that conclusion are, it is submitted, as conclusive and as unanswerable today as they were when Nicodemus first uttered them.

That admission by Nicodemus, contemporary, well-informed opponent of Jesus, and doubtless an eye-witness of many of those very "signs" (miracles),—declaring, we "*know*,"—establishes them as having been indeed performed.

Among those "signs" (those miracles) we may recall the healing of the man sick of the palsy (borne of four and let down through the roof of the house, because, by reason of the crowds, there was *no other way* to get to Jesus,—Mark 2:11, 12, R. V.); the cure of the woman having the issue of blood who touched His garment in the crowd (Mark 5:27-30, R. V.); the restoring of sight to blind Bartimæus (Mark 10:46-52, R. V.); the giving of sight to the beggar born blind (John 9:1-38, R. V.); the raising of Lazarus from the dead (John 11:43, R. V.); the raising from the dead of the son of the widow of Nain (Luke 7:14, 15, R. V.); and others.

Testified to by His friends and opponents alike,

the evidence of those miracles (those "signs") becomes overwhelming. And Nicodemus' argument and conclusion based upon those "signs" (miracles) are,—it is submitted,—inescapable,—are they not?

Those facts, His miracles (His "signs"), thus substantiated Jesus' commission from on high (as Nicodemus admitted) that He was "come from God". And they substantiate it today,—just as much as they substantiated it then,—do they not?

Jesus therefore is confessedly (by His opponents) a teacher "come from God". I so believe. I do not see how that conclusion can be successfully denied. (x)

V. I believe, as Jesus was a teacher "come from God", that He therefore was God's messenger. And I believe God was with His Messenger even as Nicodemus said, "No one can do these signs" (miracles) "that thou doest, *except God be with him.*"

VI. I believe that, being God's messenger, Jesus' message is true. God never would have given His messenger a false message to mislead or deceive His people,—would He? Moreover, God's presence and power with His Messenger, confirm His Messenger's message as true.

(x) I remember hearing it reported that the 'lawyer' who wrote the "Testimony of the Evangelists" was not a Christian when he started on his work, but became one before he finished it

It is submitted we can confidently believe the message God gave His Messenger to deliver. I so believe.

Furthermore, that message proves its own truth. It proves its truth by accomplishing, when faithfully followed, just what it promises to accomplish. (See No. VII, "Does the Bible, in its Essential Message, Prove Itself?")

We have, then, two separate, independent lines of proof of the truth of Jesus' message;—first, God's presence and power with His Messenger; and second, the results which follow when that message is practiced in men's lives.

Either one is sufficient.

I accordingly believe God's Messenger and the message He brought.

I see no way to escape either one of those conclusions. And I do not desire to escape either of them.

VII. Believing Jesus' message is true,—what is His message?

It is, as He Himself said:

1. That He came into the world "to seek and to save that which was lost." (Luke 19:10, R. V.)
That "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." (John 3:17, R. V.)
2. That "He came unto his own," (the Jews) "and

they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him", (to be their Saviour) "to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on" (trust on) "his name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of" (the will of) "God." (John 1:11-13, R. V.)

3. That "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him" (trusteth on Him) "should not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3:16, R. V.)
4. That, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." (John 5:24, R. V.)
5. That, as Jesus said, "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." (John 10:11, R. V.)

"Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father." (John 10:17, 18, R. V.)

That "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and

no one shall snatch them out of my hand. My Father, who hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand." (John 10:27-29, R. V.)

6. That "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14:6, R. V.)

7. That He will turn no one away who comes to Him desiring in his heart to be saved.

"Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John 6:37, R. V.)

8. That the Father (God) seeketh such to worship Him.

"Jesus saith unto her," (the Samaritan woman,—who was living with one "not her husband") "Woman, believe me, . . . the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father *seek* to be his worshippers." (John 4:21, 23, R. V.)

9. That His salvation is free to all. That whosoever *will*, may "take the water of life freely."

"And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that *will*, let him take the water of life freely." (Revelation 22:17, R. V.)

10. That "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." (Matthew 11:30, R. V.),—compared with any other yoke or burden in life. And everyone bears some burden or some yoke. In fact, there is no getting through life at all (that is, successfully, as measured by His standards, —and what others count?) without Him and His help. All else is wreckage. And the shores of life are choked with that wreckage.

Moreover, there is the mutual love between His followers (more or less imperfect, but still better than none at all, and one of life's best products) which cheers, lightens and brightens their mutual way.

So in both respects the lot of His followers is easier than that of any other class; and it grows increasingly so.

Weighed altogether, His life is the easiest of them all.

11. That His injunctions and promises are:

"Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Where-withal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." (Matthew 6:31, 32, R. V.)

"But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matthew 6:33, R. V.)

“I have been young, and now am old;
Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken,
Nor his seed begging bread.”)

(A Psalm of David, Psalms 37:25, R. V.)

12. “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.” (John 13:34, R. V.)

“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.” (John 13:35, R. V.)

13. “In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” (John 14:2, 3, R. V.)

14. That at the final passover just before His death, “Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on” (trusteth on) “me, believeth not on” (trusteth not on) “me, but on him that sent me.” (John 12:44, R. V.)

TESTIMONY

He saved me in early youth, which protected me from many of the pitfalls and snares of young life, and was a great help.

Separated in youth from my family and the facilities of church attendance, which finally ceased altogether for over a year (in Dresden) I wandered

away in doubt, which continued after my return home and to church facilities which I again regularly attended.

He came after me, and with loving proofs won me again.

I worked for Him, but later on, less and less; and grew cool, and cooler.

Finally, great overwhelming temptation beset me, and I fell, but not wholly. In my desperation, as well as I recall, I cried for help.

Some One came to my rescue, and Some One saved me again.

Upon Him and upon God I am trusting.

Then the dear Father gave me work to do for Him which it is a joy to perform; and life grows increasingly brighter. I started out to follow.

A LAYMAN

P. S.—It really is pitiful to see how sadly I have missed out in life;—have mistaken its objective and ideals; and wasted a lifetime of opportunities. Up to the present my personal life has evidently been a failure,—with not even its objective learnt.

Instead of life being to me a schooling in love,—a preparation for the Beyond,—I have made of it a schooling in selfishness;—which is a bar to heaven.

I never saw it before.

I started out in life when about 26 with a good

college and professional education. Unfortunately I conceived the mistaken idea that to succeed in business affairs (outside of my profession and my clients) it was necessary to get the better end of the bargain. That was selfish,—looking after my own interests first. Mine was a selfish life. And because selfish, my business interests were limited.

Well equipped by education, I made a living and laid something by,—invested in supposedly safe real estate (but mortgaged),—until the depression came and swept everything away,—save selfishness.

The end of life thus finds me bankrupt,—with nothing to carry with me into the Beyond except selfishness;—a cold, hard nature (improving, let us hope), few or no friendships with life's high objective and ideals missed, its opportunities lost, my life a failure, its total resultant,—up to the present,—a selfish soul.

There is another way of living that life,—for neither one to get the better end of the bargain; but for each to get a good end. That is not selfishness. Each is doing as he would be done by. That is one way of "loving thy neighbor as thyself". It is the way of friendly good will. May I picture it to you?

There comes one of them now, down the street, a 'Man with a Kindly Smile'.

He is pleased to meet you, and his broadening

smile betokens it. Whether proprietor, clerk or subordinate he is pleased and greets you cordially.

Willingly he puts himself at your disposal to render you a service. If you have business dealings, his kindliness shows itself in protecting your interests as well as his own.

Of course he makes of you a satisfied customer,—the best advertisement and asset a business can have. His business consequently grows.

At the end of life what has he to show for it? A sufficient livelihood; and to take with him, what? A genial nature, a friendly heart, a host of friendships; a conscience void of offense toward God and man; a nature loving and beloved; a soul fitted for heaven.

Moreover, the 'Man with a Kindly Smile' has now become the 'Man with a Shining Face'. The dear Father can and does do such things.

Which, think you, is the better way of living?

At the close of life two souls come, side by side, swinging down the street; one dark, the other shining. As they approach, they are easily distinguishable;—the dark one, an embodiment of selfishness; the shining one, kindliness personified. As they thus draw nearer, which of the twain would you rather be?

How I have missed it in life,—with love left out of the picture!

And with love left out of the picture, how much have I not lost!

How good of Him to grant me a respite still;—in which, if possible, to repair in part, the mistakes of a lifetime!

Those loveless years! What a pity! But better late than never.

But what are years,—even a century of them,—compared to eternity?

Nothing.

Life is still at its beginning.

True, the remnant of life remaining here in which to learn is short.

But with the thief on the cross, Jesus' wonderful love found in a single day time sufficient in which to save him.

So hope and trust abide with us still.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

NOTE A (page 9)—GEOMETRICAL PROOF BY METHOD OF "REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM".

Durell and Arnold's Plane Geometry (New York State Edition, 1928) thus speaks of the use in Geometry of proof by the method of "reductio ad absurdum":

"§180. Indirect demonstrations. In Book One, three methods of indirect proof have been used:

"1. The reduction to an absurdity (*reductio ad absurdum*), that is, the proof that *the negative* of a given theorem (or proposition) *leads to an absurdity*. (See Prop. X.)

"The method of exclusion, that is, showing that *any statement inconsistent with the given theorem cannot be true*. This method is a special case of the preceding; the negative of a given theorem is divided into two parts, which are separately shown to be impossible. (See Prop. XXVI, XXIX, pp.48, 71 and 74)". (Page 105.)

NOTE B (page 22)—THE SUN'S ATTRACTION BALANCED BY PLANET'S VELOCITY.

Any substantial deviation in the course of a planet from its true orbit around the sun, whether toward the sun or away from it, would,—by reason of the thereby diminished or increased distance from the sun, and the consequent increased or diminished at-

traction of it by the sun,—necessarily tend (unless readjusted by counterbalancing causes) to an *increased* deviation of that planet on its next revolution; and so on increasingly, by reason of the sun's thereby continually increasing (or diminishing) attraction, until the path of the planet developed into an ever-more rapidly increasing spiral, toward or away from the sun. And that spiral, thus growing more and more rapidly with each succeeding revolution, would, during those millions of years the scientists tell us the earth (for instance) has existed, have become more and more pronounced, until finally the planet would no longer be travelling in its true orbit, or anywhere near it, but would be out on an ever-increasing spiral; which, during those millions of years, would have developed into such great proportions as to be leading it more and more rapidly toward, and finally into the sun; or else out into the endless confines of space, whose frigidity (a hundred degrees or more below zero), ever less and less tempered by the diminishing warmth of the sun as its distance increased; would finally cause the temperature of the Earth (for example) to fall so far below its present temperature at the poles, as to render it uninhabitable for man.

Did the spiral, on the other hand, tend towards the sun, as distance diminished, the sun's increasing heat would render the Earth so hot as to be equally uninhabitable.

Astronomers have reported no deviations of the Earth from its true orbit save some slight fluctuations, aberrations, or perturbations, usually caused by other planets or the moon, etc., which usually, if not always, are rectified or readjusted by counterbalancing causes.

All combined, those variations are causing, at the present time, a lengthening of the sidereal,—the accurate,—year “at the rate of 0s.01 a century” (*a hundredth part of a second in a century*);—“in addition to any change caused by variations of the earth’s rotation” *on its axis*. (From Baker’s Astronomy, 2nd Edition, p. 79,—Columbia University textbook. Courtesy D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.)

Variations in the Earth’s rotation *on its axis* “are resolvable into two effects, one of which is *the steady . . . slowing up of the rotation, so that the sidereal day is lengthening at the rate of 0.001 second in a century*” (*a thousandth part of a second in a century*). . . “Sudden changes in the period of rotation, at times as much as 0s.003” (three thousandths of a second) “constitute *the second effect*.” (Baker’s Astronomy, 2d Ed., p. 54.)

“From 1660 to 1790 the earth ran slow; then it ran *fast until 1898*, when it became *slow again*.” (*Ibid.* p. 54.)

From which it appears that the Earth’s rotation *on its axis* “ran fast” for about a century (from 1790 to 1898); and since 1898 has been running

"slow again" (about 37 years),—thereby apparently rectifying that much (37 years) of the previous century's acceleration. Those variations in the Earth's *rotation on its axis* are therefore apparently *rectifying themselves*; and hence, presumably, are necessarily rectifying any variations caused by them in the *Earth's revolution around the sun*. Consequently, variations in the Earth's *rotation on its axis*, as well as any resulting variations in the Earth's *revolution around the sun*, may apparently be disregarded because being rectified.

That leaves only variations *in the Earth's revolution around the sun* to be considered.

Those variations, all combined, are making, at the present time, a total variation in the *Earth's revolution around the sun*, as stated above, of a hundredth part of a second in a hundred years. That is not a substantial variation. It is an infinitesimal one. The Earth today is therefore making no substantial deviation from its true orbit around the sun. It is revolving, today, in substantially its true orbit. For practical purposes and practically speaking, the Earth is in its true orbit today.

And as it is substantially in its true orbit today, that shows that the Earth has been revolving around the sun in substantially its true orbit throughout all the ages of the past (else it would be out on a spiral);—which means it has been revolving substantially in its true orbit from the very beginning;—

from and at the time of the Earth's first revolution around the sun.

And as the Earth is substantially in its true orbit today, that also shows that those two opposing forces, the sun's attraction and the Earth's velocity (whose balance against each other keeps the Earth, as we have seen, in its orbit) are *substantially balanced today*. And if substantially balanced today, then for like reasons, they too must have been substantially balanced throughout all past ages, from the very beginning;—that is to say, *from and at* the time of the Earth's first revolution around the sun.

WHAT DO ASTRONOMERS FIND?

As a matter of fact, astronomers find that with some slight exceptions above noted, the Earth and her sister planets are pursuing the even tenor of their ways in their true orbits, and if in their true orbits, then none of them are out, or have been out, on spirals either toward or away from the sun.

May it be added that once a considerable aberration in one of the planets was observed, which astronomers could not account for. That was in the planet Uranus,—then the most distant of all the planets known. It was not out of its orbit, but was *behind time* in its orbit. This was in 1821. In 1830 it was still wrong,—37 seconds behind time. In 1840

it was 90 seconds, and in 1846, 128 seconds* late; a thing the astronomers had never known to have happened to any of the planets before. (Compton's Encl. p. 244, Astronomy.)

They knew not what to make of it. Then two of them,—one in Paris and the other in England,—surmised that this aberration must be caused by the attraction of some other heavenly body to them unknown. They each calculated the direction in which such a body must be located and asked the observatories to direct their telescopes that way. Upon that being done, the more distant planet, Neptune, was discovered. (Compton's Encl. p. 246.)

Later they found that the retarded aberration of Uranus on one side of its orbit around the sun, caused by Neptune, was counterbalanced by correspondingly accelerated aberrations of Uranus on the opposite side of its orbit, when Neptune pulls Uranus forward in its orbit instead of pulling it back. (Compton's Encl. p. 246.)

Recently, fluctuations observed in Neptune in its orbit, led to similar computations which resulted in a similar discovery of a still more distant planet,—Pluto.

All of which but goes to show the substantial accuracy of the revolutions of the planets in their orbits around the sun;—and hence the substantial balancing, in each case, at the present time, of the sun's attraction of each planet by that planet's veloc-

ity (or by its momentum). And if balanced at the present time, that necessarily shows (for reasons above) that those two forces have been balanced through all the ages of the past; that is to say, that those two forces were consequently balanced *from, and at*, the time of each planet's first revolution around the sun.

NOTE C (page 22)—ECLIPSES

What is an eclipse? Is it not the moon, in its revolutions around the Earth, getting in line between the sun and the Earth, and thereby casting its shadow upon the Earth, and obscuring the sun?

"Eclipse. . . . The partial or total disappearance of the sun by the passage of the moon between it and an observer" (upon the Earth). (Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Unabridged, Edition of 1928.)

The moon's movements being known and calculated in advance, and the Earth's positions in its orbit around the sun being also known, astronomers are able to calculate just when, with the Earth moving in its regular orbit, the moon will get in line between the Earth and the sun, and, casting its shadow upon the Earth, will cause an eclipse.

But if the Earth were out on a spiral away from the sun, its circuit round the sun, being outside of its regular orbit, would be longer. Consequently it

would take the Earth a longer time to cover that longer circuit; and therefore proportionately longer to cover any given section of that circuit. The Earth would, therefore, at every point in that circuit be behind time. The year itself would be longer. Therefore at the time when, had the Earth been in its true orbit, the moon would have been in line with the sun and cast its shadow upon the Earth, causing an eclipse; as the Earth, and its moon would both be behind time in their circuit around the sun, neither of them would yet have reached that point in the circuit where the moon would be in line with the sun. Consequently, the moon's shadow would not yet fall upon the Earth, and there would be no eclipse at that time.

Were the Earth's spiral towards the sun (instead of away from it), on that shorter circuit the Earth would, necessarily, be ahead of time; and a similar difficulty would arise. The Earth and its moon being ahead of time, they would, consequently, be beyond the point where the moon would be in line with the sun, and there would, therefore, be no eclipse at that time. The year also would be shorter.

Thus, in neither case would the eclipse arrive on time.

The fact, then, that the eclipses do arrive substantially on time, as calculated, shows that the Earth is revolving substantially in its true orbit, and is not out on a spiral either away from or toward the sun.

NOTE D (page 26)—GRAVITATION AND EINSTEIN

A casual remark querying whether, in view of Professor Einstein's theories, the principles of gravitation did not need to be reviewed, has led to a consideration of gravitation and his theories.

In 1909 Professor Albert Einstein was appointed "extraordinary professor of theoretical physics" at the University of Zurich (see Life Sketch below). Theories therefore became his specialty.

A number of his theories are revolutionary. But on the other hand, some of the basic forces of the universe he has not touched upon to revolutionize, but rather to harmonize. Among the latter is that universe-wide attraction of matter for matter, by which the sun holds the planets in their orbits circling around it, and the planets their moons circling around them; which, in brief, holds the entire solar system together;—discovered by Sir Isaac Newton and known under the familiar name of the "Attraction or Force of Gravitation".

Upon that attraction or force of gravitation one, at least, of Einstein's theories rests for proof; and that is also one of the forces Einstein has chosen upon which to build his life-goal work, in his effort to harmonize it with that other basic universe-wide force, electricity, in his Unified Field Theory.

To consider this subject advisedly, may it not be well for us to review what gravitation is?

Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Unabridged (Edition of 1928) has defined it:

“Gravitation, 1.—The force with which all bodies attract each other.”

Compton's Encyclopedia, speaking of gravitation says:

“Sir Isaac Newton first proved that every planet is acted on by a force emanating from the sun, and he also proved that this force had a measurable relation to the distance of each planet from the sun.” (Compton's Encl. p. 2816, Planets.)

“The great law of gravitation which Newton thus established is that *every mass of matter attracts every other mass of matter with a force which varies directly as the product of their masses and inversely as the square of the distances between them.*” (Compton's Encl. p. 1508, Gravitation.)

It is worthy of note, in passing, how rapidly the pull of the sun's attraction diminishes with distance; that is, “inversely as *the square* of the distances between them.” (*Ibid.* p. 1508.)

The Encyclopædia Britannica thus defines it:

“Gravitation, in physical science is that mutual action between masses of matter by virtue of which every such mass tends toward every other with a force varying directly as the product of the masses and inversely as the square of their distances apart . . . the law was first clearly and rigorously formu-

lated by Sir Isaac Newton." (Encyclopædia Brit. 14th Ed. Vol. 10, p. 663a.)

Professor Jacoby, in his recent book on astronomy says:

"This . . . law" (Newton's law of gravitation) ". . . declares that an attraction exists between the sun and planet, directly proportional to the product of their masses, and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them." (From "Astronomy" by H. Jacoby, Rutherford Professor of Astronomy in Columbia University, Rep. 1926, p. 184. By permission of The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

From all of which it is evident that before Einstein conceived any of his theories, this basic force of the universe, the attraction of matter for matter, of sun for planet and planet for moon, was established; and known under the familiar term of "Gravitation".

One theory advanced by Einstein was that light consisted of matter. That theory was not new. It originated with Sir Isaac Newton nearly two centuries before; who, however, did not live to prove it;—as he did most of his theories, including that of gravitation.

"Newton explained light by the 'corpuscular' theory—that is, that it was caused by a stream of minute particles or 'corpuscles', given off at high

velocity by a luminous body. Scientists later adopted the 'undulatory wave' theory. . . . But since then the discovery of radium and the manifestations of radioactivity have proved the existence of minute particles moving with the high speeds needed for Newton's corpuscular theory, and now we are not so sure that Newton was wholly wrong on this point." (Compton's Encl. p. 2478, Newton.)

So generally, however, had the undulatory theory (advanced by Huygens, the Dutch scientist, 1690,—Compton's Encl. p. 1998, *Light*) been accepted by scientists and the world at large, that a theory of light being matter struck all with astonishment. It remained, however, to prove the truth of that theory. That Einstein did not undertake to do.

Astronomers know, or can calculate, the position of stars in the heavens at any given time. They can tell which stars, during an eclipse, are behind the sun; which are near its rim, and which are just outside its rim. During eclipses, astronomers then began watching to see if rays of light from any star, in passing by the sun, were attracted by it (as they would be, if they were matter) and were thereby deflected and thereby caused that star to occupy, apparently, a different position in the heavens from what it really did.

That they finally found to be the case, which proved that those rays of starlight had been attracted by the sun and hence that those rays of light

contained or consisted of matter; and thus established the truth of that theory. Thus, after the lapse of nearly two centuries, Newton's theory that light was matter ("corpuscles"), readvanced by Einstein (as "electrons"), was finally proven correct by astronomers of today!

"In 1920 the world of science was startled to learn that a beam of light could be deflected by gravitational attraction. The gravitational attraction was that of the sun." (Compton's Encl. p. 2000, Light.)

Obviously, Newton's and Einstein's theory of light being matter depends for proof upon that force of "Gravitation".

In a late work Einstein has undertaken to harmonize the laws of gravitation and those of electricity. That work he submitted to the Prussian Academy at Berlin in October, 1931, under the title of "A Unified Theory of Gravitation and Electricity". (See "Einstein Submits New Unified Theory", *The New York Times*, Nov. 1, 1931.)

It therefore appears instead of Einstein's attacking or endeavoring to revolutionize the law of gravitation, that at least one of his theories depends upon it for proof; and that he has also chosen that force (gravitation) as one of the foundations of his life-goal work in his effort to harmonize gravitation with electricity.

Hence gravitation, far from being attacked, or

revolutionized by Einstein, is, in point of fact, practically reaffirmed by him.

Not that gravitation needs affirmation by any one. Gravitation is able to stand alone. It proves itself. A stone released from the hand 'falls' to the ground, —*drawn by the Earth's attracting gravity*. Gravitation, therefore, can get along without the approval or support of any one; but no physicist can get along without the support of gravitation.

WEIGHING EINSTEIN'S THEORIES

Weighing Einstein's theories! How is it possible to weigh Einstein's theories?

Einstein is reported to have said repeatedly: "Not a dozen men in Europe understand my theories"; and he has not given us the name of any one of the dozen.

How, then, is it possible for us to weigh Einstein's theories? We are not one of the dozen, and know of no one who is.

Manifestly, there is no one to whom we could turn for enlightenment, nor even any one whom we could safely accept as a competent authority regarding Einstein's theories,—*saving Einstein himself*.

And were we to apply to Einstein, his explanation of his theories might be as involved and as difficult for us to understand as are those theories themselves.

Einstein's explanations might themselves need explanation.

In this apparently hopeless quandary, what is there left to guide us in an effort to weigh Einstein's theories? Evidently nothing but what Einstein himself has said about them. Only the author's own statements about his theories remain to assist us in arriving at a conclusion regarding them.

If then we are to consider Einstein's theories, it becomes necessary, as well as perhaps interesting, to see what Einstein himself has said about them.

Einstein has, from time to time, in introducing or explaining his theories, made statements in public regarding them which have been taken down by reporters and published. One statement at least he is reported to have prepared himself, and to have signed and delivered to the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, his sponsor and financial supporter during the winter he spent in California visiting the California Institute of Technology, which that Foundation is reported to have made public.

Those reported (and sometimes translated) statements made by Einstein constitute therefore the only authoritative information we have regarding his theories, by which to weigh them.

To enable us the better to consider those statements, perhaps a brief sketch of Einstein's life may be helpful.

LIFE SKETCH

Albert Einstein, German-Swiss physicist, was born in 1879, at Ulm, Wurtemberg, of Jewish parents. As a boy he lived at Munich, where his father owned electro-technical works. In 1894 the family moved to Italy, while Albert attended a cantonal school at Aarau, in Switzerland. Later, and until 1900, he attended lectures while supporting himself by teaching mathematics and physics at the polytechnic school at Zurich. He took his Ph.D. degree at the University of Zurich and published his first papers on physical subjects, which were so highly thought of that in 1909 he was appointed "extraordinary professor of *theoretical* physics" at that University. In 1913 a special position was created for him in Berlin, that of director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Physical Institute. He was elected member of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science and given a stipend sufficient to enable him to devote all his time to research. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th Ed. Vol. 8, p. 113 d.)

"The work by which he is best known, the theory of relativity, was begun in 1905 with the publication of the restricted principle . . . Though considered fantastic by many, it had secured fairly general acceptance in Germany in 1912. The restricted theory was followed by the generalized theory in 1915."

"In 1929 Einstein published two short papers on what he terms a unified field theory which repre-

sents an attempt to find a mathematical expression of formal simplicity to represent comprehensively the laws of gravitation and electro-magnetism." (Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th Ed. Vol. 8, p. 114, a.)

EINSTEIN'S STATEMENTS REGARDING HIS THEORIES

The following extracts have been taken from Einstein's publicly reported statements regarding his theories, and are given, as far as possible, in his own words (as reported,—and often translated) or from his reported signed statement.

"EINSTEIN'S NEW THEORY; TEXT OF HIS TREATISE"

"Berlin, Jan. 30.—The translated text of the New Einstein treatise which was published here today by the Prussian Academy of Science, follows:

"In two treatises which have recently appeared I have endeavored to show that one *can* reach a uniform theory of gravitation and electricity by . . .

"I have succeeded since then *in finding* a satisfactory way to the deduction of field equations, which I am stating here below.'" (*New York Herald-Tribune*, Feb. 1, 1929, p. 16.) (Italics by compiler.)

"EINSTEIN VISIONS SPACE ALONE AS AGENT OF REALITY"

"Berlin, June 16.—Space, brought to light by the material object and made a scientific reality by Newton, has, during the last century, swallowed up both

ether and light and is now about to swallow up the field and the corpuscle, too, so that it will be left as the sole theoretical representative of reality." . .

"These" (field) "laws seem now to have been found and actually are in agreement with the empirical laws of gravitation and electricity in the first order of approximation."—(*New York Herald-Tribune*, June 17, 1930.)

"NEW EINSTEIN IDEA SHOWS PARALLELS RENDEZVOUSING"

"Berlin, Sept. 19.—Professor Albert Einstein, who lately in Birmingham and again in Berlin characterized space 'as only theory representing reality', has submitted to the Prussian Academy of Science a new treatise of the 'theory of space conceptions with Riemann metrics and extended parallelism.'"

"Dr. Einstein, known throughout the world as the 'father of relativity', said in an interview in Geneva on July 27 that he was evolving another theory later than that which he propounded regarding space, and his comment was, '*Maybe people will think I am a fool when they read it*'. This was at a meeting of the League of Nations committee on intellectual co-operation. He told the committee the field in which he was working was still more vast than those in which he already had pioneered."

"Dr. Einstein takes up consideration in the treatise submitted today certain non-euclidian con-

ceptions of space—that is, those not limited to three dimensions and wherein, for example, *the euclidian definition of parallel lines does not hold good* (according to Euclid parallel lines prolonged to infinity never meet).” (*New York Evening Post*, Sept. 19, 1930.)

“EINSTEIN REJECTS THEORY OF SPACE AS GLOBE
SHAPED”

“Pasadena, Calif., Feb. 4.—Albert Einstein has a new concept of cosmology. . . . ‘*Space never can be anything similar to the old symmetrical spherical space theory*’, the professor said in closing an hour and a half talk on his new unified field theory.”

“With these words he swept aside his original concept of the universe.” . .

“The new concept of the universe hinges upon the work of two California scientists, Dr. Edwin P. Hubble, Mount Wilson astronomer, and Dr. Richard Chace Tolman, California Institute of Technology physicist.” . .

“*Professor Einstein . . . told how the foundation of the general principle of relativity was unsatisfactory and required further development. The equations were generalized to find a solution for the structure of space.*”

“This resulted in *the unified field theory* in which equations accounted for *the phenomena of electromagnetism as well as gravitation.* . . .”

"*I offer it to you like a closed box, and as one who doesn't know what is in it*", Dr. Einstein said."

"*'While it appears like a closed box, we hope to have the cover off soon and see what's in it'*", replied Dr. Walter S. Adams, director of the Mount Wilson Observatory." (*New York Herald-Tribune*, Feb. 5, 1931.)

"UNIVERSE LIKE SWELLING BUBBLE, SAYS EINSTEIN"

"WHEN IT REACHES ITS LIMIT, IT WILL SLOWLY
SHRINK, SCIENTIST TELLS BERLIN U."

"Berlin, June 26.—*The universe* was compared by Professor Albert Einstein . . . at the University of Berlin last night, to a soap bubble which is *now dilating* but one day will have reached its greatest point of expansion and from then on gradually *will shrink*. . . ."

"*'The theory of relativity* has arisen out of the effort to comprehend the world as if it were an independent system of reference as base—*so that we may make any assumptions we desire concerning our motion without ever being able to be contradicted.*'" . . .

"*'All these assumptions* do not completely bind the entire relativity theory. *Changes* are always possible, and of this possibility use must be made when a cosmological problem comes up. *That happened recently, principally through discoveries by American astronomers.*'" (*New York Herald-Tribune*, June 27, 1931.)

, "PICTURE OF SPACE SEEN ALTERED"

"*With the original form of relativity, this theory*" (of Hubble and Tolman) "*would be incompatible. The contradiction here is much worse than with the old Newton theory, because the theory of relativity is created out of such a cast that we can change it, not according to desire, but only in a prescribed way. These changes in the relativity theory have now altered the pictures of space as a consequence.*" . .

"*The American astronomer, Edwin P. Hubble, at Mt. Wilson Observatory, has investigated the extragalactic clouds and discovered that great universe-systems are moving away from us at tremendous velocity. In fact, the further they are from us the greater their speed. That is a very note-worthy event—the world thereby becomes a rushing shell in the midst of which we are sitting. . . .*" (*New York Herald-Tribune*, June 27, 1931.)

"EINSTEIN CHECKS SOLUTION TO RIDDLE OF THE
UNIVERSE"SAYS COMMON MEASURE FOR GRAVITY AND
ELECTROMAGNETISM IS CLOSE AT HAND"

"Caputh, near Potsdam, Germany, Aug. 21.—. . Professor Einstein . . said: . . he was now confident of being within sight of *the goal of his ambition*, namely, to bring the fundamental principles

of mechanics and electricity under the roof of one uniform theory." (*New York Herald-Tribune*, Aug. 22, 1931.)

"EINSTEIN BRINGS THEORY OF RELATIVITY TO DATE"

"Vienna, Oct. 14.—. . Professor Albert Einstein tonight explained *the present status of the relativity theory*. . . He spoke of calculations he had made which seemed to indicate that *the universe, if it were expanding, must have started with no volume at all and must ultimately again contract to no volume*. . ." (*The New York Times*, Oct. 15, 1931, p. 25.)

"EINSTEIN ADOPTS 5-DIMENSIONAL THEORY OF
SPACE

"CHANGES IN HIS CONCEPT OF UNIVERSE
REVEALED HERE BY JOSIAH MACY, JR. FOUNDATION"

"Dr. Albert Einstein has *added a fifth dimension* to his four-dimensional universe. This announcement is made in a statement *written by Dr. Einstein* and made public yesterday by the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, which aided in financing the work of the German scientist at Mt. Wilson, California, this year. . ."

"The scientist *abandons the four-dimensional universe and adopts the five-dimensional one* because he finds five dimensions necessary to a formula

which makes electricity and gravity fundamentally identical." . . .

"One of these *changes*" (in the relativity theory) "was *forced by the discovery* of American astronomers that the universe was exploding or expanding. Peculiarities in the light from distant star groups indicated that they were speeding at a rate upward of 7,000 miles a second and all the distant star groups examined were moving outward from the center of the universe. The further those groups were from the center of the universe the more rapidly they traveled off into space."

"These observations disagreed with Dr. Einstein's earlier idea of the universe. In the German scientist's own words, the discovery *shattered 'as with a hammer blow'* Einstein's earlier theoretical construction."

.

"This" (Then) "arose the theories of Weyl and Eddington, which, however, have been abandoned by their authors; the theory of Kaluza and also the theory of *distant parallelism*. After we both had worked more than a year on the further development of *the last theory*, we reached the conclusion that we were striving *in the wrong direction*."

(Einstein's reported signed statement to Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation, published in *New York Herald-Tribune*, Oct. 26, 1931.)

“EINSTEIN SUBMITS NEW UNIFIED THEORY”

“Berlin, Oct. 31.—Prof. Albert Einstein submitted to the Prussian Academy today his new work entitled, ‘A Unified Theory of Gravitation and Electricity.’ ”

“This is a new effort toward the ‘single law’ by which Einstein is seeking to reduce outstanding physical phenomena.” (*The New York Times*, Nov. 1, 1931.)

“EINSTEIN EXPLAINS HIS UNIFIED THEORY”

“Berlin, Nov. 18.—Dr. Albert Einstein expounded today his new theory, which *combines the laws of gravitation and electricity* in a workable formula.”

. . . .

“He cleared some of the misunderstanding which clouded earlier reports of a ‘*fifth-dimension*’, admitting that the *new dimension was fictional*, was merely evolved for the purposes of *theory* and then *abandoned*. . .”

“He said . . . gravitation is the ratio of electric charge to mass.”

“‘We have arrived at the long sought, unified theory,’ he said, ‘a very pretty thing.’ ” (*The New York Times*, Nov. 19, 1931.)

WEIGHING EINSTEIN’S THEORIES

In endeavoring to weigh Einstein’s theories, it may perhaps assist us to recall that at the outset of

his career he was appointed "extraordinary professor of theoretical physics" (see Life Sketch, above). No doubt that professorship harmonized with his natural bent, and the two together doubtless combined to render the "theoretical" his specialty in life. That may also largely account for his disregard of proofs to support his theories.

One obvious disadvantage of Einstein's confining himself so exclusively to theories, and so largely disregarding proofs in support of them, was, that whenever his theories encountered the researches of practical scientists, backed by their reported discoveries, his theories necessarily had to give way. Thus he himself is reported to have said that Hubble and Tolman's discovery "*shattered, 'as with a hammer blow' Einstein's earlier theoretical construction*" (Einstein's reported signed statement to Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation, published in *New York Herald-Tribune*, Oct. 26, 1931, above.)

While that admission was very much to Einstein's credit personally for frankness; it was hardly as much to the credit of his theories for stability.

That incident illustrates the risk of adopting theories as a foundation upon which to build one's life, beliefs, or future, compared with building them upon proven facts, which change not.

When we come to finally weighing Einstein's theories and forming an opinion regarding them,—

weighed in the light of his own reported statements in regard to them and of his prompt abandonment of them when confronted with the researches of practical scientists and their reported discoveries,—what shall we say of Einstein's theories?

What *can* we say of them?

Professor Einstein has undoubtedly rendered valuable service to science and the world in restoring Newton's theory that light consists of matter, and he may also have rendered valuable service in other lines of which we are not informed. But when we come to evaluating his theories,—his *unproven* theories,—what shall we say of them?

What can we say of them other or more than that while they may last until confronted with the researches and reported discoveries of practical scientists (for he may alter them before that himself as he did his theories of "A Five Dimensional Universe", and of distant parallelism,—"*Parallels Rendezvousing*,"—etc.,—see above), but if they last until then, and there is a conflict between the two;—which are more likely to give way,—the unproven theories of Einstein or the researches and discoveries of practical scientists? Will it be the researches and discoveries of the practical scientists?

You can answer that question yourself as well as any one, and you can also decide, as well as any one else, what conclusion to reach regarding Einstein's other unproven theories. Your own sound common

sense will tell you what answer to make to both those questions.

That appointment given him at the outset of his career to be an "*extraordinary*" professor of "*theoretical*" physics (see Life Sketch above), seems to have borne fruit and to have been, at least in part, responsible.

From all of which it follows,—does it not?—that Einstein's theories,—his *unproven* theories,—can be accepted with safety only if proven (which he rarely, if ever, does himself), and that until proven, his (or any one else's) *unproven* theories cannot be accepted as *facts*.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Some one may ask, what of the future? May not some future discovery, or some new theory propounded, upset some foundation upon which we now are resting?

Not if you are resting upon *facts*. But if you are resting upon *theories*, then quite possibly some new discovery or the promulgation of some new theory may upset older ones and disturb such a foundation. Such things occur daily.

Science will continue to make its wonderful advances into the mysteries of the universe; by which is meant it will continue to disclose to us further

ascertained *facts* discovered regarding those mysteries.

Those future discovered facts will be in harmony with all present proven facts, and also with all future discovered ones.

Why? Because facts never conflict. Truths never conflict. One truth never conflicts with any other truth. One fact never conflicts with any other fact that is actually a fact. Both stand. Both harmonize. Both are true.

Therefore no future discovered fact will ever upset any now known fact in the universe, however it may upset some present theories. It cannot upset a fact. For both facts are true. Both are founded upon a rock,—the truth.

Therefore we need have no apprehension regarding any actually proven *fact* disclosed by science;—whether present or future.

A stone, released from the hand, falls to the ground. That is a fact, a proven fact. No future discovery of science will ever upset that fact or cause that stone to fall upward.

No future proven discovery of science will ever upset the fact that the sun shines; that the Earth and the other planets are swinging around it; that their respective moons are revolving around them;—that each planet revolving around the sun has a different velocity,—corresponding to its distance

from the sun; or that the Earth is flying in its orbit with a speed of about 66,000 miles an hour; and, revolving with that great speed, has a tendency, like a stone whirled round in a sling, to fly off its orbit out into space,—as it would do instantly, were it released for a moment from the pull of the string (the sun's attraction of gravitation) that holds it in its pathway. That attraction of the sun is a proven fact (as distinguished from a theory). It therefore is impossible to disprove that fact and always will be;—because it is a fact,—a truth. Therefore no future discovered fact can ever disprove the fact of the sun's attraction,—of its gravitation,—or will ever conflict with it; because every fact (every proven fact) is in harmony with every other fact,—whether *known or unknown*.

It is otherwise with theories,—human conceptions of things (which arise in men's minds),—which every advance in science, that is, every actual advance in proven facts, is liable to upset.

There will no doubt be future theorists, and their daring theories may even be accepted by the scientific world. What of them? Are the foundations of the universe or of our lives or of our future to be upset or jeopardized at some future day by the newly propounded theories of some future theorist?

No matter how many theorists may arise, some things there are, which they will never be able to

shake. They will never be able to shake any existing fact or any law of the universe.

Future theorists will never be able to make a dropped stone fall skyward. Spite of all, the stone will still fall Earthward. This old Earth of ours will still keep on swinging in its orbit round the sun, held in that orbit by that same attraction of matter by matter, of the Earth by the sun, that causes the stone, drawn by the Earth's attraction, to fall to the ground,—gravitation.

Future theorists will never be able to shake that fact of gravitation.

And so the sun's attraction of the Earth, and the Earth's attraction of the stone and of her moon, will still continue to remain unchanged in the future, immutable,—despite any new theories of any future theorists, however much those theories may upset some other theories.

From all of which it follows it is safer for us to build our lives, our living and our future, upon proven facts; than it is for us to build them upon any theories however new, daring, or alluring, which conflict with those well-known established facts. For as between proven facts and unproven theories, the proven facts will ever stand, long after all theories in conflict with them have been discarded and forgotten.

Briefly stated, the Almighty has put in the possession of each of us the power to discern proven

facts sufficient by which to judge of His existence; and thereby to steer our barque with safety regarding Him, across the ocean of life.

Which is safer to base our life upon, the theories of some future theorist, or the Almighty and His immutable facts and laws of the universe? Which of the two offers us the firmer foundation?

WHY ARE WE SAFE?

Why are we safe? Because it cannot be done.

What cannot be done? A stone dropped, cannot be made to fall upwards. Because the immutable laws of the universe cannot be changed.

No future theorist can change those laws or make that stone fall skyward.

In drawing our conclusions based upon those proven facts, those immutable laws of the universe, that a Ruler of the universe exists,—a God in the heavens;—and making Him the foundation of our life and living here,—we are safe;—as safe as are those immutable facts and laws of the universe themselves.

We are as safe as that! As safe as those facts and those laws! As safe as that One standing behind those facts and those laws, rendering them immutable! As safe as the Ruler of the universe! As safe as the Almighty One, Himself!

How much safer than that can we be?

Are we not standing upon a rock?

How does that make us safe?

Because we are resting our lives and our future upon that Master of matter, that Ruler, God of the universe,—whose existence the planets proclaim, and whose activities are disclosed in His plans and workings in the universe around us. Because we are resting upon that same sure foundation upon which the planets themselves are resting,—those immense masses of matter, hung upon nothing, yet suspended in space;—underneath which are the everlasting arms which balanced the forces of the universe against each other and thereby kept, and are keeping, those planets still suspended on nothing.

Resting upon Him, we have underneath us those same sustaining arms as have they, but with this difference; that we are not inanimate matter, rock or stone, as they; but are living creatures,—sons and daughters of the Most High, created (in spirit) in His image and thus have upon Him a greater claim for protecting care than have the planets themselves. Therefore we are even safer than they, if we are resting upon Him; because, as taught by One of old, the Master Teacher of all time, in the eyes of the Eternal Father, we are “of much more value” than they, inanimate matter,—or even than some living creatures, such as the birds of the air.

“Are not ye of much more value than they?”
(Matthew 6:26, R. V.)

How much safer than that can we be?

Is there anything safer than that?

If so, what is it?

It is submitted there is nothing safer than Himself, nor than resting upon Him;—upon whom rest those planets and all in the universe.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Is not that sufficiently safe?—to be as safe as He is Himself? Is not that perfectly satisfactory? What more could be asked or is there left to be desired?

So long as we found our lives, our living and our future upon Him, why are we not resting upon the safest, the most powerful, the most immutable foundation in the universe;—upon *immutability itself*?

Why is not that the safest of all foundations? Why are we not safe in thus resting upon Him,—despite the theories of any future theorist? If not, why not?

“Rocked in the cradle of the deep,
“I lay me down in peace to sleep;
“Secure I rest upon the wave,
“For Thou, O Lord!—hast power to save.”

“What though the tempest’s fiery breath,
“Rouse me from sleep to wreck and death,
“In ocean’s cave still safe with Thee,
“The germ of immortality.”
(“The Cradle of the Deep”, by Emma Willard)

When we come to the end of life here, what more than that, or better than that, or safer than that, is there to be had?

Why is not that perfect safety?—resting upon Him?

Who would surrender such safety as that to rest upon any theory, present or future?

Why, then, is not the risk of future theorists upsetting a foundation founded upon Him,—the Greatest and Most Permanent Fact in the universe,—*negligible*?

What more or better could be asked?